

## SENATE.

MONDAY, January 17, 1921.

Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee for the morning light and for all the blessings continued unto us. Enable us to understand Thy requirements, that we may do those things which are just in Thy sight; that we may fulfill every obligation, love mercy, and walk humbly with Thee. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

ROBERT L. OWEN, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma, appeared in his seat to-day.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Thursday, January 13, 1921, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

## RENTS ON FEDERAL PROPERTIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of rents received from properties located on sites of proposed public buildings purchased by the Government in the city of Washington, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

## HOSPITAL AT CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury submitting an estimate of appropriation for \$100,000 additional for repairs and remodeling to adapt the hospital at Corpus Christi, Tex., to the needs of the Public Health Service, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

## CHESAPEAKE &amp; POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of that company for the year 1920, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on January 15, 1921, approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 244) providing for the payment of expenses of conveying votes of electors for President and Vice President.

The message also announced that Senate bill No. 1, an act authorizing the cutting of timber by corporations organized in one State and conducting operations in another, having been presented to the President on December 30, 1920, and not having been approved by him or returned to the House of Congress in which it originated within the time prescribed by the Constitution of the United States, became a law without his approval.

## JOSE A. DE LA TORRIENTE (S. DOC. NO. 353).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying letter from the Acting Secretary of State, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Acting Secretary of State inclosing a draft of a joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to permit Mr. Jose A. de la Torre, a citizen of Cuba, to receive instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis at the expense of the Government of Cuba.

The Acting Secretary of State points out that the passage of the resolution would be regarded as an act of courtesy by the Government of Cuba and that it would follow established precedents.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
17 January, 1921.

WOODROW WILSON.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WARREN presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from Oliver Hower, president Bighorn County Farm Bureau, of Cowley, Wyo., praying for the enactment of legislation placing a tariff on honey, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE presented memorials of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to create a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Council No. 53, of the L'Union St. Jean Baptiste d'Amerique, of Taunton, Mass., opposing the enactment of legislation to create a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Holy Name Society of St. Michael's Parish, of Lowell, Mass., opposing the enactment of legislation to create a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a memorial of sundry members of St. Mark's Church, of Pittsfield, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to create a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Boston Council of the Friends of Irish Freedom, of Boston, Mass., opposing any action looking to a refund of the British war debt or the waiver of the interest due on that debt, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NELSON presented a memorial of the Winton Lumber Co., of Minneapolis, Minn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation placing a tariff on lumber imported from Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented telegrams in the nature of memorials from J. S. Pomeroy, manager Minneapolis Clearing House Association, of Minneapolis, Minn., and O. M. Nelson, president Minnesota Bankers' Association, of Minneapolis, Minn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to allow national banking associations to establish and operate a separate savings department, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. HARRIS presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from Edgar G. Ballinger, secretary of the Chemical Congress of American Surgeons, in session at Atlanta, Ga., praying for the enactment of legislation to appropriate \$500,000 for cooperative work with the States for the use of their respective boards or departments of health in the prevention, control, and treatment of venereal diseases, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from J. K. Simmons, president of the Georgia Press Association, of Macon, Ga., transmitting a resolution passed by that association praying for the enactment of legislation to continue distribution of Federal aid to rural post roads in the respective States through the Bureau of Public Roads, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. BECKHAM, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon, which were agreed to and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 1198) for the relief of Thomas E. Phillips;

A bill (S. 1250) to correct the military record of Alexander W. Goodreau;

A bill (S. 1532) directing delivery of State war-service records to the States requesting same;

A bill (S. 1199) to correct the military record of Francis M. Benson; and

A bill (S. 1766) for the relief of Abner W. Loomis.

## EMERGENCY TARIFF.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance I report back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 683) thereon. I ask that the report may be printed in the RECORD, as it is very brief.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Report No. 683, to accompany H. R. 15275.]

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with certain amendments, and as so amended recommend that the bill do pass.

The amendments adopted by the Committee on Finance are as follows:

On page 1, line 10, strike out "30" and insert "40," so that it will read: "1. Wheat, 40 cents per bushel."

On page 2, line 12, after the word "pound," insert "except rice, cleaned for use in the manufacture of canned foods."

Following paragraph 13, insert two new paragraphs as follows:

"14. Fresh or frozen beef, veal, mutton, lamb, and pork, 2 cents per pound. Meats of all kinds, prepared or preserved, not specially provided for herein, 25 per cent ad valorem.

"15. That cattle and sheep and other stock imported for breeding purposes shall be admitted free of duty."

On page 3, line 1, strike out "14" and insert "16"; and strike out "three-eighths" and insert "one-eighth."

On page 3, line 3, strike out "15" and insert "17."

On page 3, line 4, strike out "14" and insert "16."

On page 3, line 7, strike out "16" and insert "18."

On page 3, line 22, strike out "17" and insert "19."

On page 3, line 23, strike out "16" and insert "18."

On page 4, line 1, strike out "16" and insert "18."

Insert, after paragraph 19, the following new paragraphs:

"20. Sugars, tank bottoms, sirups of cane juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by the polariscope not above 75 degrees, 2.13 cents per pound, and for every additional degree shown by the polariscope test seventy-eight one-thousandths of 1 cent per pound additional, and fractions of a degree in proportion; molasses, testing not above 40 degrees, 45 per cent ad valorem; testing above 40 degrees and not above 56 degrees, 63 cents per gallon; testing above 56 degrees, 13½ cents per gallon. Sugar draining and sugar sweeping shall be subject to duty as molasses or sugar, as the case may be, according to polariscopic test.

"That the duties in this paragraph herein imposed are in addition to the rates of duty imposed on such sugars by existing laws, and shall in no manner affect or impair such existing laws: *Provided*, That if the imposition of the duties herein shall have the effect of increasing the price in the ports of the United States of duty paid 96 degrees centrifugal sugar produced in and imported from Cuba beyond 8 cents per pound, or shall increase the price in the ports of the United States of similar sugars paying full duty beyond 8.76 cents per pound, or shall increase the price in the ports of the United States of sugars that have gone through a process of refining, or sugars fit for direct human consumption, beyond 10 cents per pound, then the emergency duty herein named shall be automatically decreased so as to prevent the prices of such sugars advancing beyond the respective prices herein named.

"21. Butter, and substitutes therefor, 8 cents per pound.

"22. Cheese, and substitutes therefor, 8 cents per pound.

"23. Milk, fresh, 2 cents per gallon; cream, 5 cents per gallon.

"24. Milk, preserved or condensed, or sterilized by heating or other processes, including weight of immediate coverings, 2 cents per pound; sugar of milk, 5 cents per pound.

"25. Wrapper tobacco, and filler tobacco when mixed or packed with more than 15 per cent of wrapper tobacco, and all leaf tobacco the product of two or more countries or dependencies when mixed or packed together, if unstemmed, \$2.85 per pound; if stemmed, \$3.50 per pound; filler tobacco not specially provided for in this section, if unstemmed, 35 cents per pound; if stemmed, 50 cents per pound.

"The term 'wrapper tobacco' as used in this section means that quality of leaf tobacco which has the requisite color, texture, and burn, and is of sufficient size for cigar wrappers, and the term 'filler tobacco' means all other leaf tobacco.

"26. Hides of cattle, raw or uncured, whether dry, salted, or pickled, 15 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That upon all leather exported, made from imported hides, there shall be allowed a drawback equal to the amount of duty paid on such hides, to be paid under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

"27. Apples, 20 cents a box: *Provided*, That if at any time the tariff on apples imported into Canada from the United States shall be greater than 30 cents a box, then the tariff on apples imported into this country shall be increased so as to make the tariff on apples imported into the United States the same as the tariff on apples imported into Canada from the United States.

"28. Cherries in a raw state, preserved in brine or otherwise, 4 cents per pound."

On page 4, line 5, strike out "15 and 17" and insert "17, 19, and 20."

Mr. PENROSE. I desire to state to the Senate that I hope at an early date to move to proceed to the consideration of the bill and that it may be made the unfinished business, and I shall make every effort to press it to early passage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

Mr. WARREN. I wish to introduce a bill in the interest of two very deserving ex-service men who, under legislation of last year, drew homesteads in an irrigation district where they were permitted to do so. They were afterwards compelled to relinquish them on account of an error in one of the United States land offices, and to give up the homesteads which had been drawn in the regular way under the law. The bill proposes to give them the privilege of making another filing and of enjoying preference rights in the next opening of farm units under the same irrigation project, as suggested by the Interior Department.

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 4859) for the relief of certain ex-service men whose rights to make entries on the North Platte irrigation project, Nebraska-Wyoming, were defeated by intervening claims (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 4860) granting a pension to Narcissa A. Grant; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRONNA:

A bill (S. 4861) to correct the military record of Daniel Wells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 4862) for the relief of Elizabeth Foster Carter (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 4863) to establish the department of public welfare and to determine its functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 4864) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 24, 1914; and

A bill (S. 4865) fixing the taxable status of lands received in exchange for lands formerly embraced in the grants to the Oregon & California Railroad Co. and the Coos Bay Wagon Road Co.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 4866) to authorize the President of the United States to lay embargoes against the exportation of petroleum oil and providing penalties; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 4867) to prohibit improper and corrupt lobbying and to regulate the employment of legislative counsel and agents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS (for Mr. KENYON):

A bill (S. 4868) to define and punish lobbying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

A bill (S. 4869) granting a pension to Amanda A. M. Taylor; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 4870) granting a pension to Amelia Perry;

A bill (S. 4871) granting a pension to W. T. Powell (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4872) granting a pension to Mrs. C. A. Thomas (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 4873) for the relief of J. B. Porter (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE (by request):

A bill (S. 4874) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, consider, and adjudicate claims of the Chippewa Indians of Lake Superior against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

#### AMENDMENTS TO SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. POINDEXTER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$496,000, for the purchase of a site and for working drawings for an archives building in the District of Columbia, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GAY submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$50,000 for the construction of a mailing platform at the New Orleans (La.) post office, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### STANDING COMMITTEES.

On motion of Mr. LODGE, it was

*Ordered*, That the standing committees of the Senate as constituted at the end of this session be, and they are hereby, continued until the next session of Congress or until their successors are duly elected.

#### STATEMENT OF MARSHAL FOCH (S. DOC. NO. 354).

Mr. LODGE. I ask to have printed as a Senate document the statement of Marshal Foch in regard to the armistice and the treaty of Versailles. It is a statement which he made on the 8th of November, 1920. It is not long, and it is very interesting. It has been only partially printed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed as a Senate document.

#### AMENDMENT OF PENAL LAWS.

On motion of Mr. NELSON, it was

*Ordered*, That the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 12161) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. L., p. 1134), and that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

#### PETROLEUM OIL IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

Mr. PHELAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 423), which was read:

Whereas, pursuant to the request of the Senate, the President of the United States on May 17, 1920, reported certain laws and regulations discriminating against citizens of the United States in foreign countries in the matter of the exploration and mining for petroleum oil: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the United States*, That the Secretary of State, if not inconsistent with the public interest, be, and he is hereby, requested to inform this body to what extent such discriminations have been practiced, where and by whom, and what steps, if any, have been taken to protect American rights.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.



## APPOINTMENT OF EX-SERVICE MEN AS POSTMASTERS.

Mr. FLETCHER. I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 424) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads be directed to ascertain from the Postmaster General the names of all former service men, and the widows of such, recommended to the President for appointment as postmaster and by the President submitted to the Senate for confirmation and not acted upon; and that the committee be further directed to consider and report promptly to the Senate all such nominations submitted, so that appropriate action may be taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

Mr. FLETCHER. The object of the resolution is, of course, apparent. Under the present rule ex-service men and widows of ex-service men have a preference in appointment, and a number of these nominations include such appointments. I wish to ascertain how many there are. I can not think that our friends on the other side will object to their confirmation.

Mr. TOWNSEND. My attention was diverted during the reading of the resolution. I did not hear it all, but I understood the gist of it to be that the Senator is asking that the nominations be confirmed.

Mr. FLETCHER. That the committee report on the number of ex-service men and widows of ex-service men who have been nominated, with a view to their confirmation.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think it is generally known that we have had no executive session during this session of Congress, and there is nothing before the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads in the way of nominations. I ask that the resolution may go over, in order that I may have an opportunity to understand just what it is, as I did not hear it all when it was read.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am perfectly willing to have it reread.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think it had better go over for one day, until I can see what it is. I am stating a fact when I say, as the Senator knows, that we have had no executive session. Only through executive session can nominations go to the committee. We have none pending before the committee now.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understand that. I wanted to secure the information with a view to an executive session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

## GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL.

The VICE PRESIDENT (at 12 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.). Morning business is closed. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, in connection with the calendar, I have been instructed by the Committee on Military Affairs to bring a certain measure to the attention of the Senate. I am informed that the reading of the calendar would commence somewhere in the neighborhood of Calendar No. 500, but on page 5 of the calendar, under General Orders, there is a bill (S. 3224) relating to the creation in the Army of the United States of the grade of lieutenant general, which I beg leave to call to the attention of the Senate at the request of the Committee on Military Affairs. I ask for its consideration at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. HARRISON. The object of the Senator is to take up the bill out of order?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; and I wish to take advantage of the opportunity to explain why the committee directed me to make the request.

Mr. HARRISON. After the bill is out of the way, we shall then proceed with the calendar in regular order?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask that the bill may be read. I do not know that I have any objection to its present consideration, but I think it is better to have the bill read before unanimous consent is granted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The Assistant Secretary read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted*, etc., That in the Army of the United States the grade of lieutenant general is hereby revived, and the President is hereby authorized, in his discretion and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint to said grade one general officer, who, within the United States, prior to the close of the recent war, rendered especially distinguished service, and two general officers, who, prior to the close of hostilities, especially distinguished themselves in command of field armies in the American Expeditionary Forces; and the officers appointed under the foregoing authorization shall have the pay prescribed by section 24 of the act of Congress approved July 15, 1870, and such

allowances as the President shall deem appropriate: *Provided*, That no more than three appointments to office shall be made under the terms of this act.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, this bill was reported by the Committee on Military Affairs October 18, 1919—more than a year ago—and it has been on the calendar ever since. As the bill has been reached from time to time on the calendar, objection to its consideration has been entered, and thus far the Senate has not considered it. The bill, as may be seen, proposes to revive the grade of lieutenant general in the Army and to authorize the President to appoint three officers to that grade, two officers who have especially distinguished themselves in command of field armies in France prior to the close of hostilities and one officer who especially distinguished himself in the United States.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New York what generals the committee had in mind when the bill was reported?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I was just about to state that. While the bill does not mention the names of general officers who are under contemplation in this connection, its very terms confine the recognition to be extended to officers of the American Expeditionary Forces to two generals, Gen. Liggett and Gen. Bullard, for they were the only officers who commanded field armies in France prior to the close of the hostilities. Gen. Liggett commanded the First Army, and Gen. Bullard commanded the Second. Gen. Liggett must be retired on account of age on March 21 next. Gen. Bullard has three more years to serve upon the active list before retirement. The committee very sincerely believes that the bill should pass, but is especially concerned over the status of Gen. Liggett. If Congress does not take any action with respect to him at this session he will be retired in the grade of major general, which he now occupies, and which grade he occupied before the United States went into the war. It is accurate to say that Gen. Liggett is the only general officer of the Army who after hostilities have ceased, after the war is over, finds himself in the same grade which he occupied before the war started. As I have said, if the Congress does not act during this session to give him some recognition for his extraordinary services, he will be retired in the same grade which he occupied when he first went to France.

Now, let me say just a word as to his services. Gen. Liggett went to France at the very beginning of our participation in the war. He went there with the grade of major general in the Regular Army in command of a division. After services covering some little time in that capacity he was promoted to the emergency rank of lieutenant general. He served in command of a corps and commanded the American corps which took part in the crushing in of the Marne salient, July, 1918, and rendered most excellent and conspicuous service upon that occasion, being the first American officer to command troops in the field in any large numbers.

He also continued in command of the corps during the St. Mihiel offensive. At the outset of the Meuse-Argonne offensive Gen. Liggett was promoted to the command of the First American Field Army and had under his command, at one time or another, approximately 1,000,000 men. He commanded the First American Field Army until the close of the hostilities, and, next to Gen. Pershing himself, he carried the greatest responsibility of any officer of the American Expeditionary Forces in the management of combat troops in the field in the face of the enemy.

The committee has believed all along that this officer is thoroughly entitled to some recognition for his extraordinary services during those trying days. Every other officer who held considerable command in France has come out of the war holding a higher grade in the regular service than the grade which he held when he went into the war. Gen. Liggett alone is the officer of the entire Army who has had no recognition whatsoever, and yet his part, next to that of Gen. Pershing, was the most conspicuous played by any officer of the American Army during the war. It is for that especial reason that the committee has instructed me to bring this matter before the Senate and to ascertain if the Senate can not act upon the passage of the bill, which would make it possible for Gen. Liggett to have this recognition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I feel very strongly that the list of promotions and appointments to the position of major general and brigadier general ought to be thoroughly examined. I do not desire at this time to indulge in any criticism as to the manner in which rewards and punishments have been distributed under the present administration, and by that I include the staffs. I think the matter will require very careful consid-

eration of the Senate of the United States before we accede to such promotions and appointments.

The bill for which consideration is requested provides for three lieutenant generals. I hope it will not be passed in that form. I realize that Gen. Liggett's case is an exceptional one, and I should like to see something done for him, but I do not wish to go further than that. If it is proposed to provide for the appointment of three lieutenant generals now, without an opportunity to examine the matter, I shall very reluctantly be compelled to object.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, in view of that situation I shall follow out the directions of the Committee on Military Affairs and propose an amendment to the bill.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, before the Senator proposes the amendment I should like to ask a question. The Senator has just stated what the facts are which justified the committee in asking for the advancement for Gen. Liggett, and, as I am informed, I am in entire sympathy with what the chairman of the committee has said in his behalf; but I should like to know who the other two generals are who were in the mind of the committee?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have stated that Gen. Bullard, who commanded the Second Army in the Meuse-Argonne offensive, would be the only other eligible officer under the first provision of the bill.

The bill does not mention any of these officers by name; but in the case of the officer who is authorized to be appointed for having performed especially distinguished services in the United States the Committee on Military Affairs had in mind the recognition of Gen. March, the Chief of Staff, during the war. It was understood by the committee when the bill was reported that Gens. Liggett, Bullard, and March would be the beneficiaries of the measure.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator from New York to say that every officer who commanded troops overseas during the war had come out with a higher grade than that held by him when he went into the war?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Every one.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think the Senator is mistaken. I know an officer who commanded troops in engagements before the Hindenburg line who has not been promoted. I think he deserves promotion. He is now a colonel, although he served as a general during that fight. I repeat he has not been rewarded, and I do not know why.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Was he a colonel at the time he went into the war?

Mr. OVERMAN. He was a colonel at the time he went into the war. As I stated, he commanded the troops which fought at the Hindenburg line and succeeded in breaking that line. He occupied for a time the grade of brigadier general, but has been put back to the old rank occupied by him when he went into the war.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is the only such case of which I have ever heard. The Secretary of War and Gen. Pershing, who appeared before the Committee on Military Affairs several days ago in behalf of this proposal, made the statement that Gen. Liggett was the only officer who had held general rank in France who had received no promotion as the result of his service.

Now, Mr. President, in view of the objection announced by the Senator from Massachusetts—

Mr. OVERMAN. Let me say right there that I went before the Secretary of War and asked that the officer to whom I have referred be promoted. I think my appearance there was resented and probably the department has disciplined the officer and not advanced him in rank because of the fact that my colleague and I went to the War Department and asked for his promotion: So he stands now where he did when he went into the war. Although he fought that great fight he has not been recognized at all.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, in view of the objection announced by the Senator from Massachusetts, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. I do so at the direction of the Committee on Military Affairs, and in doing so I desire to say that I still believe that the other officers to whom I have referred should receive this recognition; but the case of Gen. Liggett is an emergency matter, for unless this Congress acts nothing can ever be done for him of a suitable character.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if I may ask the Senator a question, was this action taken by the committee on Friday last?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It was.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was not present at the meeting of the committee on Friday, having been necessarily detained in one of the departments and not being able to get there. As I under-

stand, the amendment provides for striking out the names of Gen. March and Gen. Bullard.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The names of the officers do not appear in the bill at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. But that is the effect of the proposed amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The effect will be readily apparent when the Secretary reads the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I believe that the same treatment should be accorded all three of the officers who have been mentioned, and I shall object to the consideration of the bill to-day unless we take it up as reported out by the committee originally providing for all three.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will not press that objection. May I say to the Senator that in the case of the other two officers Gen. Bullard has three years to serve before retiring, and the next Congress, if it saw fit, could pass legislation giving him the recognition which I believe he deserves; Gen. March has four or five years yet to serve before retiring, and the next Congress or the succeeding Congress, if it saw fit, could give him the recognition which I believe he also deserves; but it must be this Congress that shall act upon the case of Gen. Liggett, and as the Senator from Tennessee knows, every day is precious. The committee had a very full attendance; we heard Gen. Pershing, who made a personal plea for his great lieutenant who helped him so ably to fight the great battles in the last six weeks of the World War, and by a unanimous vote the chairman of the committee was requested to lay this matter before the Senate in just the way I have done it. I think we might well take this opportunity to show that republics are not always ungrateful.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Tennessee that the committee has not reversed its action with regard to the favorable report of this bill as it was originally presented, and there is no purpose now to abandon the idea of taking proper care of Gen. March and Gen. Bullard; but the emergency is that Gen. Liggett retires in March, and unless this action is taken now it will never do him any good. He ought to be taken care of.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with what the Senator says about Gen. Liggett; but it is equally clear that unless the three come in together Gen. Bullard and Gen. March will be left out, and I think all three are entitled to this recognition.

Mr. FLETCHER. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will withdraw the matter for a week, and let us discuss it in the committee and see if we can not make some arrangement that will bring about the desired result.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will my friend the Senator from New York yield for a question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. Has the committee taken any action regarding the large number of promotions in the Army that were sent to the Senate at the beginning of this session—something like 4,000, I believe?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will say to the Senator from Arkansas that the committee has not, because those nominations are not yet pending before the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. ROBINSON. No executive session has been held since that time?

Mr. WADSWORTH. None.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Suppose we should pass the bill, and suppose the House should pass the bill, and the President sent in the nomination of Gen. Liggett, we would still be in the same position that we are now, because there has been no reference of any of these nominations, and unless we have some assurance that the appointment will be confirmed I think we are going through a useless proceeding. That is why I suggested a delay of a week to talk it over.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me further for a brief statement?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. My information is that several thousand military nominations were sent to the Senate at the beginning of this session, and that no action has as yet been taken looking toward a consideration of those nominations by the Senate or any committee of the Senate. In that list of nominations so sent to the Senate a long while ago, and which the Senator from New York has not even asked to have referred to his committee, there are a large number of officers who are just as much entitled to the gratitude of this Republic, just as much entitled to the fair and prompt consideration and action of the Senate, as is any officer whose promotion is contemplated by the



bill now submitted out of order by the Senator from New York.

In that list of several thousand officers are hundreds of men as brave as ever wore the uniform of the United States Army, as gallant as any men who ever went down to battle or ever breasted the flood of death; and I want to ask the Senator from New York now whether it is proposed that these nominations shall be defeated or rejected by the failure on the part of the Senate to act?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator let me call his attention to the fact that there are probably about 4,000 of these officers whose opportunity for appointment will expire on March 4?

Mr. ROBINSON. And they will go out of the service of the United States—out of the Army.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Just let me finish—so that there are 4,000 who will lose their position entirely unless we act upon their nominations.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ROBINSON. And not only is that true, but the United States will lose their service. So, Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland is making a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FRANCE. I desire to inquire if the question before the Senate is the request for unanimous consent for the consideration of this measure?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the question.

Mr. ROBINSON. I object, Mr. President, to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. FRANCE. I object, and call for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That ends it.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I understood that the Senator from New York had secured unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill, and that a motion had been made to amend it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. He had not.

Mr. PHELAN. Then I am in error.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is in error.

#### CHIEF GUNNER ROBERT EDWARD COX, UNITED STATES NAVY.

Mr. PAGE. From the Committee on Naval Affairs I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 12469) to authorize the award of a medal of honor to Chief Gunner Robert Edward Cox, United States Navy, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Let it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The Assistant Secretary read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to award a medal of honor to Chief Gunner Robert Edward Cox, United States Navy, in recognition of the extraordinary heroism he displayed on the occasion of the accident which occurred in the after turret of the United States ship *Missouri* on April 13, 1904.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### HOSPITALS FOR SICK AND DISABLED SOLDIERS.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I made objection to the consideration of the measure for the promotion of lieutenants general because I felt that it would be improper for the Senate to take up the consideration of the promotion of generals until it should have made provision, by passing the hospital bill, for our sick and disabled soldiers, who by the thousands are suffering to-day because adequate hospital facilities have not been supplied. I desire to give notice that to-morrow, at the close of the morning business, I shall call up the bill providing hospital facilities for the sick and disabled soldiers.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Maryland that the Public Health Service desires at this time that the building program for hospitals shall be taken care of in the sundry civil bill; and I will say to the Senator, from what I know of the feeling of the Appropriations Committee that the first appropriation toward that program will be made as requested, not only by the Secretary of the Treasury but by the Surgeon General of the Army. In other words, the testimony before the committee shows that \$30,000,000 will be required for the building of hospitals. The plan has been mapped out. The plans for the buildings have been agreed upon. Perhaps in some cases the locations have not been selected; but the appropriation asked for this year is \$10,000,000, and if the Appropriations Committee provides the

\$10,000,000 for beginning that plan there will be no need whatever for passing the bill to which the Senator has reference.

Mr. FRANCE. When may it be hoped that the committee will act upon the matter?

Mr. SMOOT. Just as soon as we can dispose of the appropriation bill, and it will be reported to the Senate some time this week. I will say to the Senator that if the item is carried in the appropriation bill it will become a law long before the bill to which he has reference could pass the Senate and then pass the House.

Mr. FRANCE. I am not concerned about the method by which the appropriation is secured, but I am very much concerned about the delay. This bill was reported on the 2d day of last June, and it was then considered to be an emergency measure. We could secure no action on the 2d of last June. We have been unable to secure action since.

Mr. SMOOT. It is an emergency matter, and the Secretary of the Treasury and also the Surgeon General of the Army have stated that it will take three years to build the different hospitals; and they ask for \$30,000,000, and request that in this appropriation bill \$10,000,000 be provided for the first year, and I will say to the Senator that I have no doubt it will be done.

Mr. FRANCE. I am very much encouraged to hear it.

#### REDUCTION OF THE ARMY.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I desire at this time to call up the matter of the reconsideration of the vote on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 236) directing the Secretary of War to cease enlisting men in the Regular Army of the United States until the number of enlisted men shall not exceed 150,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the author of the amendment, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROO], is not here, and I hope the Senator from California will not ask for a vote on the matter in his absence. It is his amendment that we propose to reconsider. I understand that the Senator from Wisconsin will be back on Thursday, and the matter can be voted upon then. I have just looked at the rules to see what the parliamentary situation is. I do not know whether I have the right to ask that the matter go over or not. If I have, I should like to make that request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will tell the Senator in a minute.

Mr. McKELLAR. It seems to me that the motion should go over until the junior Senator from Wisconsin, the author of the amendment, returns. He will be here on Thursday.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I call the attention of the Senator from Tennessee to the fact that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROO] was not here at the time the vote was originally taken, and I understood at the time that he was paired. Doubtless his pair will protect him in connection with any vote that is now taken. Let me remind the Senator that we were told by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] that recruits are being enlisted at the rate, my recollection is, of 2,000 a day. He pointed out the additional cost for each day's delay in the disposition of the joint resolution. I remind the Senator that the motion to reconsider suspends the action of the Senate and the present status is continued, so that these enlistments are going on every day that the matter remains in abeyance. Under these circumstances I rather think the Senator from Wisconsin would not like to ask that the matter be further delayed on account of his absence, imperative though it may be.

I trust that the Senator will withdraw his objection and allow us to take a vote on the motion to reconsider.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was a mere suggestion on my part. I then move, Mr. President, that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, and on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. ASHURST. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HENDERSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK]. In his absence I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and vote "nay."

Mr. KNOX (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. I am advised that if he were present he would vote as I shall vote. I therefore feel at liberty to cast my vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). I have a temporary general pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]. I do not know how he would vote on this question, and I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

I transfer my pair to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL]. I am informed that he would vote the same way I shall vote on this question, and therefore I vote "nay."

Mr. MYERS. Has the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN], which I transfer to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] and vote "nay."

Mr. GLASS. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. HENDERSON (after having voted in the negative). I observe that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] has entered the Chamber. Therefore I will have to withdraw my pair announced a few minutes ago and withhold my vote.

Mr. McCUMBER. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] and vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS];

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT]; and

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN].

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] on account of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 45, as follows:

#### YEAS—26.

Borah	Gronna	McNary	Swanson
Capper	Harrison	Norris	Trammell
Culberson	Heflin	Overman	Walsh, Mass.
Dial	Johnson, S. Dak.	Reed	Walsh, Mont.
France	Jones, Wash.	Sheppard	Williams
Gerry	Kenyon	Simmons	
Gore	McKellar	Smith, Md.	

#### NAYS—45.

Ashurst	Hale	Nelson	Smoot
Beckham	Harris	New	Spencer
Brandeggee	Hitchcock	Page	Sterling
Calder	Kellogg	Penrose	Sutherland
Coit	Keyes	Phelan	Townsend
Curtis	King	Phipps	Underwood
Dillingham	Kirby	Pittman	Wadsworth
Fernald	Knox	Poindexter	Warren
Fletcher	Lodge	Ransdell	Willis
Frelinghuysen	McCumber	Robinson	
Gay	Moses	Smith, Ariz.	
Gooding	Myers	Smith, Ga.	

#### NOT VOTING—25.

Ball	Henderson	McLean	Stanley
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	Newberry	Thomas
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Owen	Watson
Edge	Kendrick	Pomerene	Wolcott
Elkins	La Follette	Sherman	
Fall	Lenroot	Shields	
Glass	McCormick	Smith, S. C.	

So the Senate refused to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is, Shall the vote whereby the joint resolution was passed be reconsidered?

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is, Shall the vote whereby the joint resolution was ordered to a third reading be reconsidered?

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is now in the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the joint resolution be amended by striking out the phrase "150,000" wherever it occurs, and in lieu thereof inserting the phrase "175,000."

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest to the Senator from New York that the Senate had better reconsider the vote by which the amendments were concurred in.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Has not that vote been reconsidered?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; it has not. The Chair is of the opinion that the parliamentary question is, Shall the vote whereby the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole were concurred in by the Senate be reconsidered?

Mr. ROBINSON. That was the suggestion I rose to make.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the vote whereby the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole were concurred in be reconsidered?

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Now the question is on concurring in the amendments as in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There will have to be a change in at least one of the amendments. The percentage to which the different branches of the service may be recruited should be changed to 62½ from 53½.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the amendments are nonconcurring in, that amendment can be subsequently offered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I have been kept from the Senate by indisposition, and I am not familiar with the status of this particular measure. Will the Chair enlighten me on the status of the joint resolution, so far as it affects the question of the size of the Army?

The VICE PRESIDENT. In Committee of the Whole the Senate practically instructed the Secretary of War to cease further enlistments and to discharge soldiers at present in the Army until the Army has been reduced to 150,000. The original joint resolution called for 175,000. I do not think the Chair is authorized to state the arguments on the question.

Mr. REED. I do not care for the arguments; but now the situation is that we are about to vote to go back to 175,000?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is it substantially, whether the Senate will concur in the amendments or not.

Mr. BORAH. We are about to vote on the question as to whether we will go back to 175,000.

Mr. REED. That is the statement just made by the Vice President.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Does not the question now recur on concurring in the amendments which reduced the Army to 150,000, and those who desire to see the Army reduced to only 175,000 will vote against concurring in the pending amendments?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am not in any physical condition to express myself on this matter as I would like to do, and I do not expect that what I am about to say, which will be very brief, will change the result of the vote; but I want to say it for the sake of the Record.

When the bill proposing to fasten a standing Army upon the country of 300,000 was before the Senate a few months ago, I opposed its passage, and I think I made two motions looking toward a reduction. In one of them, as I recall, I placed the number at 200,000, not because I believed we needed 200,000 men, but because I hoped that we might succeed in making a reduction which might be impossible if the figure were made lower.

At that time I challenged the sponsors of the bill to state any good reason why we needed an Army of 300,000 men in a time of profound peace, and I received no reply to that challenge.

The bill was put over at 300,000 on the mere naked assertion that we needed that many men and proposed to have them. I am delighted to find that the same Senators and the same committee within this very short period of a few months have revised their views and are willing to reduce the Army to 175,000. It seems that in the progress of time some of the old, sound ideas of our Government are beginning gradually to filter their way into the official conscience of the country. But in my humble judgment we have not progressed as far in that direction as we should.

I still demand to know why we need 150,000 troops in a time of profound peace in the United States of America. We got along with an Army of 75,000 to 80,000 during all of the years preceding the war. I think 105,000 was the maximum that we had even when we were threatened with serious disturbance along our southern boundary—89,000 the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] corrects me, and I thank him.

Mr. FLETCHER. One hundred and five thousand is the correct number.

Mr. REED. I am speaking without notes and merely from recollection. Everybody knows that the Army had then temporarily been increased, because of the serious nature of our affairs in Mexico. So far as we can now observe a better state of affairs exists in Mexico than has existed there for a considerable number of years. It appears, and I trust appearances are not deceptive, that they have established something bearing a very close relation to a stable government in Mexico. Whether they have or whether they have not, if any difference should arise in the future, we know that we have now in the United States two and one-half million trained men, and that we could, if unhappily called upon to do so, raise and equip an army for all troubles that might arise south of the Rio Grande River.

I inquire, then, whether there is any danger from abroad that calls for the maintenance of an Army of 175,000 men? What nation is about to attack us? From what direction does the menace come?

Certainly not from Germany, for that country, lies there prostrate and disarmed and we are being told every day that her people are starving, and American citizens are being called upon to contribute their money to feed the children of Germany,



Is there any danger from Austria? That country has been dismembered, and out of its component parts have been constructed three or four other countries, our own children, with whom we are not only at amity but to whom we have been loaning money, in my opinion contrary to law, since the war ended. They not only have no disposition to attack us, they not only have no ability to attack us, but they are not able to stand apparently without the financial prop of the United States to sustain them. Austria, it is said, has practically applied for a receivership. There is left a population of 8,000,000 people with a city of two and one-half million people, and I think all economists agree an impossible condition has been created and that the Austrian Kingdom must be in some way reconstructed in order that it may continue to exist as a government and as a nation.

Are we fearful of France? I not only say that we are in no danger from France, if France were ill-disposed, but in my judgment we have in France a friend who not only would not move to our attack but would probably come to our defense in case of any struggle.

Are we fearful of Great Britain, a country whose soldiers stood by our soldiers only a few months ago, to whom we have loaned, I believe, over five thousand million dollars, the interest upon which is not being paid, and an extension, while not legally granted or officially asked, is nevertheless, in fact, granted? And the indulgence of this Government is an additional evidence of our friendly interest in Great Britain. We surely are in no danger of attack from Great Britain at this time.

There remains but one country powerful enough to in any way injure us. I have not spoken of Italy. Any attack by Italy is unthinkable. The country to which I refer is, of course, Japan. So far as I am concerned I am inclined to regard with very great discredit the rumors that Japan is working herself into a war fervor against the United States. Economically, it is impossible for her to wage any considerable war with the United States. She could only do so if she had the aid of Great Britain, and if there is any real danger of Japan and Great Britain combining against the United States, then we need not an army of 175,000, but we need military training in the United States and a preparation such as the country has never yet dreamed of, and the bill does not answer such a purpose.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I would prefer to yield in a moment when I get to a stopping point.

Mr. MYERS. Does the Senator get to a stopping point often?

Mr. REED. I was hoping to. That is the reason I did not yield to the Senator. But I will yield to him now.

Mr. MYERS. I will withdraw that humorous question, Mr. President, because I know the Senator, like all other speakers, does stop quite as often as he starts to speak, and he always talks most interestingly.

Mr. REED. I will yield to the Senator now.

Mr. MYERS. I thank the Senator for his courtesy. The Senator asked a few minutes ago for some reason why the Army of the country should be maintained at 175,000 enlisted men. I will give him what I think is one sufficient reason.

Gen. Pershing appeared before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs last Friday and stated, while he thought it would be very unwise to reduce the number of enlisted men below 200,000, that if the number should be reduced to anything below 175,000 it would practically destroy the framework of a skeletonized Army which was contemplated and provided for by the Army reorganization bill, which is a plan for the maintenance of an Army of certain size and dimensions that was favored by Congress last year. He stated that while he thought the number should not go below 200,000, it might be reduced to 175,000 without destroying the plan, but to reduce it below 175,000 would so disrupt and impair the framework and foundation of the Army that if we should be called upon in any emergency in future to enlarge the Army to a much larger number in a comparatively short time, we would be unable quickly and effectively to do so, because the framework for the enlargement of the Army would not be there, intact and unimpaired, to the required extent. We would not, in that event, have the regiments in sufficient number to enable us to recruit a large Army and expand the regiments into divisions within a reasonably short time, and it would simply be equivalent to undermining the foundation of a house, Gen. Pershing contends, to reduce the number of enlisted men below 175,000.

The Secretary of War was there with Gen. Pershing, and was equally emphatic in the same contention. I do not believe that anyone has ever accused the Secretary of War of being a militarist.

Mr. REED. No; nor of being military.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Nor of being a military expert.

Mr. REED. No; nor of being a military expert.

Mr. MYERS. I believe it is acknowledged by a good many people that he is a good executive officer and did good executive work during our war with Germany.

Mr. REED. I expect there are some people who acknowledge it.

Mr. MYERS. I am one of them, I am glad to say.

Mr. REED. I am not, I am equally glad to say; so we will let it go at that. I am going to take this statement up in a moment and answer it. I thought it would probably be aside from the line of thought I was on, and that is why I asked the Senator to defer it for a few moments. I want to conclude the thought I was on.

I ask, are we in danger of attack by Japan? Economically Japan could not maintain the contest without aid from the outside. She could not land a single soldier in the United States. I say that for this reason: Her battle fleet is not the equal of the battle fleet of the United States, and until the battle fleet of the United States is sunk, no transport laden with soldiers can cross the Pacific Ocean and land upon the American coast.

The only reason we were able to transport soldiers from the United States during the war with Germany was because the British fleet had swept every German ship from the ocean except the submarine, and the British fleet, plus the American, French, Italian, and Japanese fleets, was able to smother the submarine and to defend our transports against it. If there had been upon the ocean a half dozen German men-of-war, capable of keeping the seas, we should have had the gravest difficulty in landing any of our troops, and probably many of our transports would have gone to the bottom. Until Japan can sink the last of the American vessels or drive them under the guns of our fortresses or compel them to intern she can not transport an army across the Pacific Ocean, and if she landed here with anything less than 3,000,000 men she would have simply landed a cemetery, where the last one of them would sleep forever.

In order to land such an army and to maintain it necessarily implies a complete mastery of the ocean, fleets of fast transports to carry goods and armament and reinforcements. Upon the other hand, we have the superior fleet, judging by every rule of naval warfare, and, following one or two sharp conflicts, Japan ought to be completely overcome upon the ocean and every vessel she has sent to the bottom. If we are not in that position, it is our business to get in that position at once; not wait for foreign ships to land upon our soil, but be prepared to stop them in midocean. So the proposed Army can not be justified upon the theory that it is necessary to protect us against raids of Japanese soldiers.

What, then, do we need with such an Army? Now, I come to the only answer that I have heard given: That a scheme of a grand army of a certain size, with certain units, has been laid out; that in order to produce such an army in skeleton form it is necessary to have 175,000 men, so that the skeleton may be of such dimensions as to have built about it the complete scheme of the grand army; and that, therefore, that scheme for an army of a certain size having been adopted we must have a skeleton army of a certain size. Where does that leave us? It simply leaves us in the position that all we have got to do is to go back and change the original scheme a little and make the original scheme fit an army of 150,000 men, where it now fits an army of 175,000.

Mr. MYERS. I think the Senator from Missouri is right about that. If we reduce the skeleton below 175,000 enlisted men, which Gen. Pershing said would necessarily be required, we must go back to the Army reorganization bill and reconstruct the whole plan.

Mr. REED. Exactly; and that would be a terrible thing to do. It would take the Army experts probably about a week's time to revamp the whole plan; probably they could do it in three hours. The premise of this whole argument is that we have fixed a certain scheme for a grand army in case of war—

Mr. MYERS. It would require action by Congress to change it.

Mr. REED. And that now we must not change that, but must adapt everything to it, although the scheme was adopted at a time when Congress was under the impression that we had to have an army in time of peace of 300,000 men.

Mr. MYERS. If the Senator will permit me, such a change would require action by Congress as well as by the General Staff of the Army.

Mr. REED. Certainly, and Congress can take that action just as easily as it can pass this joint resolution. That is the trouble with this whole line of argument. It is based upon the fallacy that Congress did something, adopted a certain plan, that is immutable; that every other plan that is hereafter adopted must fit into that plan; when really all we have got to do is to go back and modify the original plan a little bit and shape it to what we think is the condition of affairs to-day.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator from Missouri pardon an interruption?

Mr. REED. I will.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] is dwelling, and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] has dwelt, upon the size of the skeleton in order to suit the size of the flesh and blood. No one has yet told us how the size of the skeleton was reached, because no one has told what the size of the entire body of flesh and blood is going to be. The Senator from Montana has not told us; Gen. Pershing has not told us; nor has anyone else. If the skeleton is required solely for the purpose of fitting the flesh and blood, and no one has told us what the thing with the flesh and the blood on it is going to be, how can anybody justify the requirements of the skeleton?

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator. Of course, the argument he makes is unanswerable unless these gentlemen can come forward and show that the plan that has been adopted for the full-sized Army is one that it is absolutely necessary to have and that any change in it would be detrimental to the Republic. They have not given us that information, as I am informed.

Now, let us see about the opinions of military experts. I would not pluck one wreath from the laurels that adorn the brow of Gen. Pershing; I have heard him criticized; I have heard people say he was a martinet; I have heard a lot of such things; but I have never seen anything yet that led me to any other conclusion than that he was a great soldier. This great soldier, however, is confronted by a bill passed by Congress, which he probably O. K'd—I do not know as to that—embodying a scheme for an immense army in time of war. I do not know the Regular Army officer, the professional soldier—and I say it with all the respect in the world—who has not always been clamoring for a greater standing army; I do not know the naval officer who has not also been clamoring for a great navy.

It is just as natural as life itself to these men engaged in these professions to want to make their respective branches of the defense of this country impregnable; it is just as natural as it is for a man to want always to find his arms strong enough to beat down any adversary. That is natural; I have no criticism of them; but it is the business of Congress to stand between such demands and the burdens which must be placed upon our people; to strike a just medium and to determine what the policy of the country shall be. We have always had to do that. If the Regular Army could have written the military bills of the past we would have had an Army of half a million men in this country many years ago. If the Navy could have written the naval bills of the past, we would have had a war fleet that would have been capable of driving the combined fleets of the nations of the world into their ports and under the guns of their fortresses. But Congress and the American people have not taken that view, and they have been wise in not taking it.

Military men make mistakes. The same gentlemen who are here now saying we can not get along with less than 175,000 men a few weeks ago were here saying we had to have 300,000

men. It was their testimony that was read to me to silence me, or to attempt to silence me, a few weeks ago when I insisted that the Army should not be 300,000 men. Now, a change has come over the spirit of our dreams. I do not know what has caused it, but, thank God, it has come.

Do you quote Mr. Baker to me? Mr. Baker was for 300,000 men. Perhaps somebody will quote Mr. Daniels to me. One day he is in favor of total disarmament, as silly a proposal as ever fell from human lips, for if you totally disarm the white race, the civilized nations of the world, they would be overwhelmed the next day by the barbarous hordes. Reduction of armament is a different question, and one for which I have a very hearty sympathy; but disarmament is not a thinkable thing. So one day Mr. Daniels is in favor of disarmament; the next day he thinks it would be the most glorious thing in the world if all the German war fleet were taken into the middle of the ocean and sunk; the next day he demands that we build a grand new fleet greater than that of Great Britain, having in the meantime sunk the exact duplicates of the ships we are to produce; and the next day after that, without batting an eye, we see the German war fleet turned over to Great Britain to increase by 33 per cent the already overmastering force of that nation upon the high seas. So, when you quote authority to me, I reserve the right to do my own thinking about it.

Mr. President, I have just this to say in conclusion:

This country stands face to face with some tremendous problems. We are just beginning to emerge from the fever of this war, and there will result, there is resulting, the natural reaction which comes at the end of any fever; the weakness, sometimes almost the paralysis for a time, of the body that has been consumed by the fires of enthusiasm, or of fever, or of whatever term you may choose to employ. We must rebuild our own industries. We must rehabilitate our own country. The task is a gigantic one, and as we approach it we find ourselves compelled to pay every day the interest upon twenty-eight thousand millions of dollars of war debt, with ten billions of that money loaned in Europe, and probably a large amount of it never will be returned; but in the meantime we must pay the interest, and we must wait the day when that money may or may not be returned. For the present it is our burden, and we must bear it. That heavy weight upon our taxpayers and upon our industries is a serious handicap upon the prosperity of the Republic, and may produce disastrous consequences if we are not wise.

In addition to this, as an incident to the war, there will be fastened upon Government extraordinary expenses which prior to the war we were not called upon to meet; so that altogether there now rests upon the people of the United States a burden of taxation such as our fathers never dreamed of, and such as we never dreamed of until the trouble was upon us. In order to meet this mighty burden we must levy a tax of staggering proportions. We must take a large part of the profits and the earnings of our people every year in order to meet these inescapable burdens.

In order to show how our Government expenses are mounting I will print a table showing the appropriations for 1921 and the estimates for 1922. The table is as follows:

Table comparing by bills estimates of regular and permanent annual appropriations for the fiscal year 1922 with the appropriations made for the fiscal year 1921.

[Prepared by the clerks to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House, Dec. 6, 1920. The column of 1921 appropriations includes the sums carried for that fiscal year in deficiency and miscellaneous appropriation acts for similar purposes. The estimated appropriations for 1922 will be found in detail in the annual Book of Estimates transmitted to Congress on Dec. 6, 1920.]

	Appropriations, fiscal year 1921.	Estimates, fiscal year 1922.	Increase (+) or decrease (—), 1922 estimates compared with 1921 appropriations.
REGULAR ANNUAL APPROPRIATION ACTS.			
Agriculture.....	\$31,712,784.00	\$41,989,384.00	+ \$10,276,600.00
Army.....	992,558,365.00	992,811,070.20	+ 300,252,705.20
Diplomatic and Consular.....	9,220,537.91	11,983,848.94	+ 2,763,311.03
District of Columbia.....	18,373,004.87	25,039,044.99	+ 6,666,040.12
Fortification.....	18,833,442.00	35,676,533.66	+ 16,843,091.66
Indian.....	10,020,555.27	11,989,703.67	+ 1,969,148.40
Legislative, executive, and judicial.....	106,570,610.11	136,452,634.97	+ 29,882,024.86
Military Academy.....	2,142,212.70	6,464,432.73	+ 4,322,220.03
Naval.....	433,279,574.00	679,515,731.47	+ 246,236,157.47
Pension.....	279,150,000.00	265,190,000.00	— 13,960,000.00
Post Office.....	504,434,700.00	585,406,962.00	+ 80,972,262.00
River and harbor.....	12,400,000.00	57,114,915.00	+ 44,714,915.00
Sundry civil.....	435,848,806.92	803,446,196.86	+ 367,597,389.94
Total, regular annual appropriation acts.....	2,254,544,592.78	3,353,080,398.49	+1,098,535,805.71

<sup>1</sup> Includes for 1921, \$9,218,537.91 in Diplomatic and Consular appropriation act and \$2,000 in deficiency appropriation act.

<sup>2</sup> Includes for 1921, \$104,749,326.11 in the legislative, executive, and judicial act, \$1,453,000 transferred from the sundry civil act, and \$363,284 transferred from deficiency acts.

<sup>3</sup> This sum includes estimates for certain expenses under the Treasury Department aggregating approximately \$3,500,000, which has been paid for 1921 and prior years from the indefinite appropriations "Expenses of loans."

<sup>4</sup> Includes for 1921, \$462,575,190 in Post Office appropriation act, \$41,855,510, the amount estimated to carry out the postal reclassification act, and \$4,000 in a deficiency act.

<sup>5</sup> This is the amount carried in the sundry civil act plus \$75,000 carried in the deficiency act and \$125,000 in the Federal water power act and minus \$1,453,000 transferred to the legislative, executive, and judicial act.



Table comparing by bills estimates of regular and permanent annual appropriations for the fiscal year 1922 with the appropriations made for the fiscal year 1921—Continued.

	Appropriations, fiscal year 1921.	Estimates, fiscal year 1922.	Increase (+) or decrease (-), 1922 estimates compared with 1921 appropriations.
PERMANENT AND INDEFINITE APPROPRIATIONS.			
Interest on the public debt.....	\$975,000,000.00	\$922,650,000.00	- \$52,350,000.00
Sinking fund.....	253,404,864.87	265,754,864.87	+ 12,350,000.00
Expenses of loans.....	<sup>6</sup> 12,499,182.96	12,499,182.96	- 12,499,182.96
Roads, construction of.....	<sup>7</sup> 104,000,000.00	1,000,000.00	- 103,000,000.00
Customs service, repayments, etc.....	20,200,000.00	27,000,000.00	+ 6,800,000.00
Indian funds and interest on same.....	23,775,000.00	23,475,000.00	- 300,000.00
Miscellaneous.....	38,847,752.29	60,896,496.00	+ \$ 22,048,743.71
Increased compensation to certain employees (\$240 bonus).....	<sup>8</sup> 35,000,000.00		- 35,000,000.00
Total permanent and indefinite appropriations.....	1,462,726,800.12	1,300,776,360.87	- 161,950,439.25
Grand total regular annual and permanent appropriations.....	3,717,271,392.90	4,653,856,759.36	+ 936,585,366.46
Deficiencies, 1920 and prior years.....	187,006,165.28		
Railroads.....	<sup>10</sup> 800,000,000.00		
Grand total.....	<sup>11</sup> 4,704,277,558.18		

<sup>6</sup> The indefinite appropriation "Expenses of loans" is repealed after June 30, 1921. Expenses for such purposes are estimated for 1922 in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

<sup>7</sup> The appropriations for road construction were carried for a series of years in the good roads act, approved July 11, 1916, and the Post Office appropriation act approved Feb. 28, 1919. The appropriations under those acts stop with the fiscal year 1921, except \$1,000,000 for roads in national forests.

<sup>8</sup> The increase in miscellaneous permanent items is made up principally of estimated amounts as follows: \$6,500,000 in the clothing and small stores fund of the Navy, \$5,097,500 for the civil service retirement and disability fund, \$3,750,000 for payments to States from receipts under the oil leasing act.

<sup>9</sup> Approximated.

<sup>10</sup> This sum is made up as follows: \$300,000,000 for new loans to carriers and \$500,000,000 on account of Federal control of railroads. No amount is included to cover sums estimated to carry into effect the 6 months' guaranty.

<sup>11</sup> The reduction in the stated amount of appropriations made during the second session of the Sixty-sixth Congress is due to revision of the estimated amount required for the sinking fund, interest on the public debt, and expenses of loans.

What, then, is the part of wisdom? Clearly it is to cut every expense of this Government absolutely to the bone, wherever those expenses can be cut without injuring the country or without placing it in peril. If those considerations are sound, apply them, then, to the Army. The Army never produces a dollar. It eats from January to January. It consumes and it destroys. It is nothing but an expense. It is justifiable alone upon the ground of necessity; and it is incumbent upon those who demand at the close of this war that our Army shall be more than doubled to show the necessity for it. That necessity is not shown when the Secretary of War comes in here and says that if you reduce the Army to 175,000 it will interfere with some other plan that can be changed overnight.

Mr. President, I protest against a great standing Army in a time of peace. We ought to build up a National Guard in this country. We ought to have a small, highly organized, and highly efficient Regular Army. We ought to have the means by which we could quickly produce war supplies. We ought to get back to the idea that this war is over. So far as any future war is concerned in which the United States may be involved, I do not believe there has been a time within the memory of any man here when we were as little likely to have trouble with any foreign Government as at the present moment.

First, all the world lies prostrate and exhausted. We alone are able to stand erect. Why, only a little while back Great Britain debased her currency, reduced her silver money to 50 per cent of dross, a thing she had not done since the days of Henry VIII. You can get with an American dollar a bushel full of the shipplasters of two-thirds of Europe. They are in no condition to make trouble, and, in my judgment, they have no disposition to make trouble.

In the next place, Europe has learned a lesson that it will take her a hundred years to forget. European generals, European military experts, said that you could not make a soldier out of a citizen under about three years of hard training. They found in the Argonne that we could make them in about 30 days, for many a man went into the Argonne fight and into the other battles of that war who had not had 60 days of military training. I do not mean that we should not have some military training of a proper character; I am not speaking of that; but Europe learned the lesson that this great country, where men are raised in an atmosphere of freedom, produces a class of men who, if they are driven to the defense of their country, will know how to defend her; and knowing that, even though they may have a superiority of military training, they will be very slow to enter upon a conflict with the 110,000,000 people of this land.

I am not one of those jingoists who think the United States is the only country on earth, but I say to-day we are in no danger of attack. We are in no danger of attack, first, because we have done nothing to cause attack; second, because Europe is prostrate and could not attack us if she wanted to; third,

because she is not disposed to attack us; and, fourth, because the world has learned the lesson that the people of this country, standing within their seagirt shores, can beat back the embattled hosts of this earth. We do not need any 175,000 Regular Army. We do not need to make a military camp of the United States.

Singularly enough, this cry comes to us from the lips of those who at the same moment are preaching the general doctrine of disarmament. Now, I believe it will not be many years until the sensible powers of this earth will get together and put a limitation upon the size of the armies and navies by mutual consent. I hope that time is coming; but I do not think the United States is setting any very good example when it proceeds to increase its Military Establishment at a time like this. So I am in favor of a Regular Army of 150,000, and if I had my way it would go to 100,000, and I am not sure but that it would go lower than that.

Mr. President, I thank you.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I had hoped before leaving my seat to hear from the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], who has made the motion to reconsider—to hear what could be said, relying upon the fact that, with his ability, if there was anything that could be said in favor of an Army of 175,000 men as against 150,000, he could say it. I have missed being satisfied in that regard.

Mr. President, it has been several months since the Senator from Missouri and I have agreed about anything of any very great importance, but are thoroughly agreed about this particular question. I am especially in accord with him when he says that there was "never a time in the history of these United States when we were as little likely to be drawn into war as we are now. From the time we were 13 little colonies upon the Atlantic slope to the time in the beginning of the nineteenth century when we were almost afraid of hostility with the Barbary pirates; through the War of 1812, when we were humiliatingly defeated on land everywhere except at Drury's Lane and New Orleans; when we could not put a fleet upon the sea and had to rely for our glory at sea only upon individual ships' and individual captains' and individual sailors' records; even at the end of the Civil War, when, using our arms against one another, we had shown to the whole world what we could do in a family fight—the world never through all those experiences came to a time when it was as little prepared to challenge hostilities with the United States as it is right now. Mark you, Mr. President, there is this difference: In the old times we faced the contempt of the expert military and naval classes, while sometimes we had the respect of the populace behind us. But now we have gained the military respect of the experts in the armies and the navies of the world.

The Senator is wrong in saying that we "demonstrated that we could make a soldier in 30 days." We did not do that, of course. You can make in 24 hours a fighting machine that will die, but you can not make an efficient fighting machine, which

can win against anything like equal armament, in any 30 days or in any 60 days or in any 90 days.

But, Mr. President, that is not the question before us. Unless we are going into an offensive war, in which we are to be aggressors, if we are to be on the defensive, we will have in front of the Army we may maintain here, as the first line of defense, a navy; the second Navy in the world. Mark you, Mr. President, when I say that I do not say enough. It is, strategically speaking, the first Navy in the world, because the Navy of Great Britain is necessarily scattered from the Pacific to the Indian Ocean, through the Mexican Gulf, around through the Mediterranean, and about the Isthmus of Suez, in the South Pacific, and in the China Seas. She would be incapable tomorrow of mobilizing at a given point within the waters of the Western Hemisphere a navy anywhere near equal to that which this American Republic could mobilize, unless she left all of her vast dependent dominions of alien and somewhat unfriendly people ungoverned, for it would amount to that.

The Senator from Missouri might have gone a step further, Mr. President. He might have said that not only was there never a moment in the life of this Republic—not only not an hour, or a day, or a week, or a month, but never a moment—when we were “so little likely to be challenged to a war”; but he might have added that there never was a moment when we were so well prepared for it. Two million men who went to France have for the most part come back. God bless those who did not, and those who did. Three million more men, who received from 60 to 120 days of training in military camps in America, are nearly all here. Judging by the life of veterans upon the pension roll, most of them will be here for half a century.

Mr. McKELLAR. And those men here who have had that training in actual warfare will be far better trained than the men being trained to-day.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is no doubt about that; and, Mr. President, as the Senator from Tennessee has said, the men who received the training, who are here, and who are not wounded, and are not maimed, have received a training far superior to what this scheme in this bill will give them, for this scheme is a scheme of short training.

Mr. President, taking those two things together, I say that for the American Republic to be afraid, for the population of these United States to be afraid, is to confess themselves cowards. It is like a great, big, grown man being afraid of a child with a popgun. Where is the balance of the world? God pity it and God bless it. God pity it especially—bankrupt, insufficiently clothed, hungry. Is it seeking war? No; merely seeking shelter and food. And here we stand talking about the necessities of national defense. I would as soon go out on the street and confess myself afraid of a pregnant woman armed with a parasol.

Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri was right about another thing. The world has learned not only one thing, as the Senator said, but it has learned two, and the second is worthy of being mentioned in connection with the first which he mentioned. It has not only learned that these people of ours know how to defend not only their homes and themselves, but even their liberties and their ideals and their traditions, when questioned abroad, but it has learned that the other branch of the English-speaking race across the ocean can do all that also. I expect the Kaiser is a little bit ashamed to-day when he thinks of his reference to the old “contemptibles.” They died; they died almost to a man—Scotch Highlanders, Scotch Lowlanders, Englishmen from all the shires, Welsh Fusiliers; but there was the spirit of Richard of the Lion Heart, of King Hal, and of all the great galaxy of English-speaking heroes behind them, of the men who spoke the language which Shakespeare spoke, who thought the thoughts which Milton thought, and who dreamt the dreams which Tennyson dreamt, all of which these people outside of the sacred race, language, and its literature, its commerce, and its law, can hardly understand. They think of us somehow as “shopkeepers” over there and “money grubbers” over here; and we are, when that is what we are trying to do—to succeed in business. But they have learned now to speak of us as defenders of democracy and ideals and traditions when that is what we are trying to do.

I would “take foul scorn to myself” that I, as a part of this American Republic, should talk about us defending ourselves from an impoverished Europe, a maimed and crippled Europe, a fatherless and widowed Europe, a discordant and chaotic Europe, a mutually hating and mutually weakening Europe. But I do not know what I would take to myself—it would be worse than foul scorn—if I thought to prepare to get ready for an attack from little Japan, an attack across the Pacific Ocean from Japan. She would be bankrupt

within six weeks after she declared war against us. The whole money power of the world would be in the other scale with us and against her. All the timidity and the cowardice and the fear of the world would be in the scale with us and against her. Nearly all the civilization, the literature, and the commerce of the world would be in the scale with us against her; and besides that, she has a ruling class which has proven its wisdom, and that wisdom has counseled them to have no trouble with us unless they could have the fleet of Great Britain behind them, and even then it would be only a water fight. Do you imagine for a moment that they could ever get the fleet of Great Britain behind them? Great Britain refused to renew the late treaty except upon condition that if there were trouble between Japan and the United States England's promises were void. Why? Simply because blood is thicker than water; that language is the expression of thought, and we have a common thought; that literature is the mausoleum in which past thought is treasured up, and we have a common mausoleum; that religion makes us akin by its very heterogeneity in both countries, but nearly all Christian, professed at any rate; that the common law makes us akin; that we have the same rules of commerce and of debt payment and of commercial honor.

Mr. President, I have stood in my time in another branch of this Congress, appealing to the men of the Pacific slope in a great racial issue to save a civilized minority from a majority of veneered savages. I met with some response, but not much. They come here to-day, appealing to me in behalf of a civilized majority against a semicivilized minority.

I can understand the superior man appealing for help against an overwhelming majority of brute force, but I can not understand the superior man, when he has the majority, appealing for help against a minority of brute force.

Whence has the danger all come? Whence the need of an Army of 175,000 men, whence the need of 150,000 men, whence the need of 125,000 men, whence the need of 100,000 men?

Mr. President, let me look at the dollar side of this thing. Those of you who know me well know that is a side to which I do not often look very intently, either in my private affairs or any other affairs, because I think it is generally a secondary consideration. If a thing is worth money, no matter how much money it requires, and you have the money or can raise the money, then take it and pay for it and be done with it. But what is a dollar? It is an agreed sign and token of certain intrinsic value marking the measure of interchangeable value, amongst other things. When we come to the question of marking the interchangeable values between the wealths of peace and the glories of war there are some thoughts that must interest us.

What is a Government dollar—a dollar in the Government Treasury? My dollar is a dollar that I have earned; but what is a Government dollar? Is it a dollar that the Government has earned? No; not a Government in the world ever earned a dollar since the world began. Every dollar that drops into a Government till was first extracted from some citizen's pocket. It does not fall like manna from heaven to bless the chosen people. Some flesh-and-blood man, woman, or child works for it, delves for it, sweats for it, thinks for it, feels for it, plots for it, and more or less surely gets it, and after a while the Government takes it away in part.

What is the only excuse of the Government for taking a dollar away from me or you? It is that the Government *must* have it. Must have it for what? For a purpose higher than my individual need or use. What are the purposes higher than my individual use? Common defense, common civilization, protection of life, liberty, and property.

When we come to consider the dollar as a measure of interchangeable values between war purposes and peace purposes, what happened the other day? We saved \$35,000,000 a year on one vote. By reducing the so-called skeleton Army from 175,000 to 150,000 men we saved \$35,000,000 a year. Measured in Army men and ammunition that is what it comes to. Now, what is it measured for peace purposes? The first thought that occurs to me is that we need right now \$30,000,000 to put into fireproof hospitals for shelter for the maimed and crippled and gassed from the last war. That saving in one year would build those hospitals and leave \$5,000,000 over to go to other purposes besides the saving for the future.

But that is not all. Measure that amount of dollars in education, new schoolhouses, better-paid school-teachers. Measure it in transportation, superior and better equipment for railroads, better highways. Measure it in social uplift, if you can. It is impossible to state how you should measure it there, because every dollar put into social uplift is equal to twenty dollars spent without reproduction.



Mr. President, in this world of ours "knowledge comes, but wisdom lingers," and the trouble with men as a rule, in my opinion, is that they are always going around hunting so-called "expert" advice. The expert has knowledge, but almost never has wisdom. Nearly always all he knows is facts; all he knows is detail. His mind never rose to a conception which means a unison of the mind of man with the mind of God, which constitutes wisdom, and he is always thinking about his technical training.

He is like the old fellow in Athens who wanted to hang hides on the fortress wall. After a stone-quarry man had spoken and recommended stone, and the brickmakers had recommended brick, he said, "But, after all, men of Athens, there is nothing like hides." Show me a man who has had the experience necessary to make him an expert upon petty details and I will, as a rule, show you a man who has not a general concept of any description. I will show you a man who is like the fellow who got into a dark closet with the limburger cheese, thinking that he had opened the door outdoors. When his wife asked him what about the weather, he said, "I don't know, but everything is as dark as hell and smells like cheese." He thought the entire universe—terrestrial and celestial—was one great big bundle of limburger cheese—darkness.

I have known men who would spend all the money of the Government in order to carry out a biological experiment in the Agricultural Department. I have known other men who would spend it all, or nearly all, trying to perfect the wings of an airplane. I know a number of naval and military men who would take every dollar of our annual revenues, one for the Army and leave nothing for the Navy and the other for the Navy and leave nothing for the Army, and both of them leaving nothing for civil life, for education, for social betterment, for the uplift of men and women, for making the children of the next generation better than the children of our generation, and the children of the next generation after that still better again; taking all for present might, nothing for future right.

I am tired of this everlasting prating about force. Force does not conquer in the world except primarily and for a short time. In the long run the spirit which informs force and which is behind it—traditions, ideals, and thought—conquers the utmost brute force that ever was. There is no instance of it similar in all history to that of our cousins across the sea. Not once but many times now have they prevented world dominion, totally unprepared according to all the doctrines of sailors and of soldiers.

Spain first threatened world dominion and the little ships of Britain went on, and between God's dear winds and their own sailanship the armada was scattered to the winds. Louis XIV next threatened world dominion, and the wit and wisdom, the statesmanship and sailormanship of the English-speaking race settled that little dream, and we English here in America were part of it.

Then the time came when Napoleon had a great big machine built up magnificently by the French Revolution, with an informing spirit of freedom behind it, and again the sea power and free thought of the English-speaking race defeated him, although toward the close of the struggle it was divided against itself, this part of it over here in America fighting against that part over there in Europe.

In God's name, why should I be afraid of Germany now? Ideals, such as she had, destroyed; the notion that might makes right gone to the grave; Prussian junkerdom, bankrupt, humiliated, feeling stupid; socialized industry all in anarchy. Nobody ever was much afraid of Austria nor of Hungary nor of Turkey; even the cowards were not afraid of them in peace times, before the war. And now we are going to fall back on being afraid of Japan. Let us have a great big Army to meet a possible invasion from Japan and a great big Navy to whip a Japanese Navy at sea!

Old Bismarck had a good deal of sense. One day some one said to him, "Prince, have you ever studied out a method of landing a German Army in England?" "Oh, yes," he said, "I have 20 plans, all of them perfectly feasible, but I have never studied out a plan for getting the army out of England after I landed it." Japan might land a million men on the Pacific slope to-morrow, if you can imagine it possible, and they would have California currants and fruits and grapes and a little wheat to feed on until they had been starved to death, unless they could keep control of the seas and unless, in addition to keeping control of the seas all the way back to Japan, they could keep control of the sea routes to the food-producing countries of the world, of which Japan herself is emphatically not one.

People used to make a great deal of fun of us down South for being scared about the white man's civilization. I heard

Tom Reed say once that "if he was half as much afraid of niggers as most people in the South seemed to be, he believed he would move out." But I have lived to see the day when a white man on the Pacific slope is scared of about 5 per cent of the population around him. We had at least the excuse of fearing for our civilization because it was threatened in several States by a majority of from 60 to 70 per cent, and yet in the real sense we were never scared—that is, we were not scared of the local situation. We were scared of outside interference and outside help to the numerical majority which, in our opinion, we believed to be an inferior race.

Mr. President, I wish I could hear some one say something outside of purely technical detail about "skeletons" and "full-fledged" armies, and that sort of nonsense, that could convince anybody that the Government needs even 100,000 men in the Army. I can imagine an argument in favor of the Navy; I can imagine that, although I do not think it is sound. I can easily imagine an argument in favor of an overwhelming air force. I think it is sound. But it surpasses my comprehension how we can stand here, with the blood of our ancestors on both sides of the ocean in us, and profess that we have got to have this big stick to protect ourselves against—I started to say an enemy—but not even against an enemy; against nobody; against no threat of any description. But when we come to consider that every dollar in the Government's till is taken out of the pocket of a citizen, that every dollar appropriated to one purpose is subtracted from another purpose, and that every dollar appropriated to destructive purposes is subtracted from reproductive purposes of some description, the situation is still worse.

I would rather take this \$35,000,000—the difference between an Army of 150,000 and 175,000 men—and give it to a committee to distribute amongst the deserving poor than to appropriate it to this timid, cowardly, senseless purpose. It is almost like a man buying two coffin plates for himself when he thinks he is going to die, when he ought to know that one is enough, and when God knows that he would get along very well without any at all.

I am simply yearning in every pore of my body to hear some intelligent human being utter a word showing it to be necessary or vital or even important for the American people to have 175,000 men in their Army. Oh, I have heard one argument, but that is not the argument that controls this body, I hope. The other day we voted through by a decent majority—of how much I do not remember—the motion to reduce the Army to 150,000 men; but to-day the Senate reverses itself. I have heard, and the people have heard, no reason for that reversal. It has not been avowed upon the outside, at any rate. No reasonable argument has been made for it by any man, but I have heard this morning a reason, which was given me by a very frank, intelligent, and brave man. I asked, "What do you want with all these troops?" He said, "To keep down the lawless elements in the United States." Not to meet foreign aggression, but to overcome internal discord—some yet unborn but anticipated American bolshevism, perhaps!

Mr. President, let me say this: Whenever the American people, with their magnificent middle class, their educated men, reach the point where the only thing that can keep down disorder and bolshevism is an army, their liberties and their order have already disappeared.

I was once in the town of Dijon, in France, when Gen. Chanzy was sent there by order of Marshal MacMahon to take a liberty cap off a statue. I turned to a friend of mine and said, "It is absurd to send pretty nearly a division of the French Army here to take a liberty cap off a bronze statue." He said, "But you do not know these reds, Bonnets Rouges," he called them at that time, Red Bonnets, Red Caps. He said, "If you ever let them get above the surface, all is lost." I said, "Whenever a majority of the citizenship of a country can think that, everything is already lost." Whenever the gentlemen of a country are not willing to go down in the gutter and fight its riffraff, then it has all gone anyway. So if there be in any man's heart the idea that he is going to preserve order in America against bolshevists or reds with something of an army, let him get rid of that idea. We may do it for a certain length of time, but it can not be done forever, because unless you have in the hearts and minds of your citizenship that which will overcome the anarchistic forces of revolution and chaos it is only a question of time when you must give up anyway, and life, liberty, and property cease to be secure amongst you. It all depends on your willingness to fight, to fight individually and in the gutter, and one gentleman in the gutter is equal to three of these fellows, even though he may be physically but half their strength.

You do not need this Army for foreign purposes; we do not need it for police purposes. It will hurt us economically; it

will hurt us industrially; it will hurt the great peace purposes of an enlightened civilization; it will be an absolute waste of money and will not satisfy anybody except the fellow who has been in a dark closet with nothing but limburger cheese, whether in the Navy or in the Army, and can not smell anything except military or naval affairs.

No man has a higher regard for Gen. Pershing than have I. In my opinion he made the second best military record in all this war. He made it quietly, like a gentleman; he neither rushed to the front for glory, nor went to the rear for safety. He dared the unpopularity of his men, with all the history of America behind him showing that great popular military chiefs become Presidents, in order to maintain discipline and to have an efficient army and to do the American people's work in France and in Flanders. However, when it comes to taking his advice about the size of an army, I had just as soon take a darky's advice about the fatness of a possum. Of course, the darky favors the heaviest possum. His whole education has been of a military character; his entire line of thought is toward military affairs. We might just as well take the utmost partisan in this body on the Republican side, and ask him coolly to consider the clash between his school and the opposing school of politics, or take me and ask me coolly to consider the clash between my school of politics and yours. I would do the best I could at it, but I would be utterly incapable of coming to an impartial conclusion. So with Gen. Pershing.

During Mr. WILLIAMS's speech,

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The READING CLERK. A bill (H. R. 15130) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand it is the desire of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs to dispose of the pending joint resolution this afternoon. So I ask unanimous consent to lay aside temporarily the unfinished business for the purpose of considering the joint resolution only.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HARRISON. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. This is Calendar Monday. Is the calendar in order after 2 o'clock?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not. The Senator from Mississippi will proceed.

After Mr. WILLIAMS's speech,

Mr. BORAH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	McKellar	Simmons
Beckham	Hale	McNary	Smith, Ariz.
Borah	Harris	Moses	Smith, Ga.
Brandeggee	Harrison	Myers	Smith, Md.
Calder	Heflin	Nelson	Smoot
Capper	Henderson	New	Spencer
Colt	Hitchcock	Norris	Sterling
Curtis	Johnson, Calif.	Overman	Sutherland
Dial	Johnson, S. Dak.	Page	Swanson
Dillingham	Jones, N. Mex.	Phelan	Townsend
Fall	Jones, Wash.	Phipps	Underwood
Fernald	Kellogg	Pittman	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Kenyon	Poindexter	Walsh, Mass.
France	Keyes	Pomerene	Walsh, Mont.
Frelinghuysen	King	Ransdell	Warren
Gay	Kirby	Reed	Williams
Gerry	Knox	Robinson	Willis
Gooding	La Follette	Sheppard	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only a moment, as I am very anxious to have this joint resolution disposed of one way or another. I prefer to have it disposed of in my way, but I want it disposed of. The sooner it is disposed of the sooner the enlistment will stop and some of the unnecessary expenditure be stopped.

If we have an Army of 175,000, we save about \$150,000,000, and if we reduce it to 150,000 we save about \$175,000,000. In other words, the difference between 150,000 and 175,000 men represents an expenditure of from twenty-five to thirty million dollars. I think those figures are generally conceded to be correct. So far, therefore, as the saving to the Treasury is concerned, there is very little dispute. Thirty million is not much, considering the reckless way we spend money, but I feel the overburdened taxpayer will be thankful for even small beginnings.

The controversy arises over the other proposition. The able Senator who is the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee stated upon last Friday, when interrogated as to the necessity of this Army, that he did not anticipate any trouble from foreign powers, but that he had in mind our domestic situation, the utilization of the Army for police purposes. I read the statement in order that I may not misquote the Senator. I asked this question:

The Senator concedes, does he not, that if we should have trouble with a foreign power 150,000 men would be just about as effective as 175,000 men?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not anticipating trouble with any foreign power. I have in mind the demands which may come upon the Regular Army to perform what is equivalent to police duty. It has been called upon several times heretofore to perform such duty, and there is a great possibility that it may be called upon in the future to perform similar duty.

That has not only been stated upon the floor of the Senate but it has been the argument which has been passing about in the cloakrooms and elsewhere, as to the necessity of holding this Army up to 175,000 men; in other words, that the police obligation—an obligation which ought very seldom to be placed upon the Army at all—is going to require an Army of 175,000 men. The people are asked to maintain an Army of 175,000 men not to protect us from foreign foes but to protect us from ourselves. It is a far larger Army than we need for that purpose.

Mr. President, if we were considering the question of preparing for an actual conflict with some foreign power, or were considering a program of preparedness for war, I should accept the judgment of Gen. Pershing and that character of men without any hesitancy, and should abide by their views. But if we are creating an Army for police purposes, and police purposes only, I think a layman may be permitted an opinion upon that subject perhaps of equal moment with that of an expert, and I am utterly opposed to an Army of 150,000 men or 175,000 men for such a purpose. If the only object and purpose of the Army is that of police duty in the United States, we do not need it, and its presence here and the burden which it imposes upon the people are more calculated to increase discontent than to compose the situation in which we now find ourselves.

If we were going to have any difficulty with a foreign power we would not reduce this Army at all, or if anyone anticipated in the slightest way any difficulty from abroad we would not reduce it below the figure which was provided for in the Army reorganization bill. It must be, therefore, that we are placing ourselves in the position before the country of retaining an Army of 175,000 men to keep the peace in the United States, and I am unable to vote for any such proposition.

Gen. Pershing stated that there is a condition of discontent, of restlessness. I am not now quoting his exact language, because I have not seen it. I am only quoting that which he is reported in the newspapers to have stated. I know that there is an element of discontent, not only in our country, but throughout the world; but it arises not from conditions which an Army of 175,000 men will tend to settle, but from another condition of affairs, and that is the ever-increasing and growing burdens which are placed upon the people, and which the people see no way of escaping from, under the present program.

Let me call attention to the state of our expenditures at the present time. These figures were gathered by Dr. Rosa, of the Bureau of Standards:

Our appropriation in 1920 for past wars was \$3,855,482,586.

Our appropriation in the same year for education of the people of the United States was \$57,093,661.

In other words, our appropriation for past wars was 68 per cent of all the appropriations made by Congress in 1920. Our appropriation for education was 1 per cent of all the appropriations made by the Congress of the United States for 1920.

That is a more deplorable record than Germany ever had; it is an infinitely more deplorable record than the soviet government has now; and that is what is causing the discontent, the restlessness, and the utter loss of faith both in Government and in political parties to relieve the people of the burdens under which they are now bending.

Our appropriation in 1920 for future wars was \$1,424,138,677, or 25 per cent. Add that to your 68 per cent, and you have 93 per cent of all the appropriations made by Congress in 1920 for the purposes of war, past or anticipated.

Our appropriation for civil departments was \$181,087,225; for public works, \$168,203,557.

If any reason had been given to the committee or to the Senate upon which one could base action relating to anticipated difficulty, of course we would not stop with 175,000 men; but the able Senator from New York says that an Army of 175,000 men makes the Republic perfectly safe, if he is correctly quoted in an interview which was given out Saturday after



the vote, and that an Army of 150,000 renders it unsafe and insecure.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I did not give out any interview at all.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator undoubtedly saw the interview which was said to have been given out.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have not seen any interview attributed to me.

Mr. BORAH. Then I will correct that and take another cue, that the Senator is advocating here upon the floor 175,000 as rendering the situation safe, and opposing 150,000 because it would render the situation insecure and unsafe, and the difference between the two is 25,000 men. I have the utmost respect for the judgment of the Senator from New York. However, it must be an arbitrary figure, an arbitrary judgment, unless, Mr. President, it is based upon what a member of the Army told me Friday night, to wit, that if you reduce it to 150,000 you interfere with the official conditions in the United States Army.

He said he knew of one captain who had 6 men under him, and perhaps if we reduce it to 150,000 he may have but 4 men under him, which would make it very difficult, of course, for that officer to earn his money. The fact is that we have built up a vast scheme organization, and it seems necessary, in the judgment of those who are advocating 175,000 men, to keep enough men to give color at least to the necessity of the official organization. It is thought unwise to impeach in any way this great scheme, so we must have enough men to justify the scheme.

Mr. President, then there is no hope in the future of reducing the number of men at all. We must always keep 175,000 men in the field in order to give color to the maintenance of the Army organization which we have. We must take that in hand some time, and I see no reason why we should not do it now, as well as later.

We can certainly cut off twenty-five million or thirty million here if it is a mere question of protecting the domestic situation, better than we can deprive the men who went into the Great War—and who have come home disabled, crippled, afflicted for life—of the hospital necessities which they are entitled to have. I am informed that they eliminated in the House the other day, either before the committee or in the House, a proposed appropriation of some \$20,000,000 to build hospitals, and I am also informed by a party who is in a position to know that the young men who went into the war are traveling upon the streets and running at large in a mental condition which makes them unsafe to the community, and that men afflicted with the dreadful disease of tuberculosis are dropping dead upon the streets for want of care and protection.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. REED. I take it the Senator is familiar with the fact that the charge has been made in the press that a number of these ex-soldiers have been put in public almshouses by the Government and are maintained there along with the pauper patients. There was a "whitewash" report denying that occurrence, which I have had some occasion to examine, and I affirm that it is true; that they did that very thing in the city of Chicago.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am sure that no Senator here who has examined into the situation will deny that the condition of affairs is deplorable in that respect. We feel under the necessity of cutting down those appropriations. We feel under the necessity of curtailing expenses in those regards. It does seem to me, Senators, that if it is a mere matter of protecting our domestic situation, if we anticipate no trouble from abroad—and none has been pointed out—that it is the part of wisdom, it is the part of patriotism, to disregard the mere Army organization, for a season at least, and transfer the twenty-five million to the boys who served in the Great War, who are dying for the want of care. I venture to say that we will continue to trim and curtail in such instances, rather than in this matter.

I do not criticize those who think we ought to have 175,000 men, but I do think that they ought to state a reason other than the mere fact that it is an arbitrary figure which has been fixed by those who are interested in the Army reorganization bill. This is a serious matter, this piling up these great expenditures which a discouraged and anxious people will have to pay. We are pledged to economy and we are also pledged by every principle of humanity to care for the brave fellows who contracted disease in the service of the Nation. Let us act in good faith with the taxpayers and cut to the bone. Let us save

everywhere we can for another reason, and that is that we may deal in decency and justice with the crippled and the afflicted.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I have been in favor of an Army of 175,000 men, but the arguments made by the Senator from Idaho, and by others who preceded him, have weakened me in my position. Does the Senator think that if we eliminate 25,000 men, if we reduce the number from 175,000 to 150,000, we can use the money saved toward taking care of the very men he is talking about, some of whom are wandering on the streets of my home town suffering from tuberculosis and with no place to go? I am informed that the city of Prescott, with five or six hundred beds, is not able to take care of half of the ex-soldiers who are seeking some sort of relief, and I confess that I shall be led to vote with the Senator in the hope that we may divert all of the money possible to the aid of those men who were hurt in the last war.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am unable to assure the Senator that we can transfer it, but the Senator knows, as well as I, that if we continue making expenditures of this class it will be absolutely necessary that we cut somewhere, and we will cut those who are dying rather than those who are still exerting power.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. KING. Has the Senator made any investigation with a view to ascertaining whether or not those who have charge of the appropriations made to care for these disabled soldiers have properly expended the money? If the Senator will pardon me, my recollection is that we appropriated for the current year some two or three hundred million dollars. I have heard many complaints of inefficiency and maladministration by the boards which have charge of the expenditure of that money. It has been charged that if they had properly applied it, the evils of which the Senator complains would not exist; that there was an ample amount appropriated to properly care for all of the wounded and disabled men, but that the boards that have had the expenditure of the money have been grossly inefficient, have wasted the money, have consumed it in salaries and in useless and unnecessary expenditures. Can the Senator give us any information as to that?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. On last Saturday morning I read to the Senate a letter from the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, in which he pointed out that, in round numbers, 10,000 beds are urgently needed for discharged soldiers who are afflicted either with tuberculosis, or neuro-psychiatry—that is, insane men—and he pointed out that those ex-soldiers were absolutely without facilities of hospitalization, that 10,000 beds were urgently needed, and he urged that Congress should pass the bill introduced by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE], and reported favorably to the Senate, that 10,000 beds, at \$3,000 apiece, be provided, making the appropriation \$30,000,000. It was stated this morning on the floor of the Senate that \$10,000,000 would be appropriated. I ask Senators to read the letter from the Surgeon General, and I ask them, why do you select the arbitrary figure of \$10,000,000, when you require \$30,000,000 to hospitalize 10,000 men?

Why should not the Appropriations Committee bring in an amendment appropriating \$30,000,000, as the Surgeon General requests and the necessities demand?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. WARREN. Answering the Senator from Arizona, I will say that the sundry civil appropriation bill came from the House carrying total appropriations of \$380,000,000. Two hundred and twenty-three million dollars of that is for the very purpose mentioned by the Senator, and like purposes, all for War Risk, vocational education, and the Public Health Service, leaving but about \$160,000,000 for all other purposes for the entire United States.

If the Senator will permit me further, that bill is before us, and exactly what the Senator has mentioned is a very live subject. We have had before us the head officer of the Public Health Service; we had before us as lately as this morning the active officer of the vocational education service, and we propose to do something, we propose to do all that ought to be

done, in the judgment of the Appropriations Committee, in the present year, in this appropriation bill, unless in the meantime we shall have here passed a bill which has been reported to the House favorably from the committee, and for which, I understand, a special rule has been adopted, which is likely to bring the measure up at any moment, because it would reach the President sooner than would the appropriation bill. But the matter is having attention.

Mr. BORAH. Is the Appropriations Committee prepared to take care of the appropriation asked for by the Surgeon General?

Mr. WARREN. The Surgeon General does not expect \$30,000,000 the coming fiscal year, and we expect to give all that can be used in starting the work. These figures as to the number of patients are predicated upon the figures given by actuaries of insurance companies, and cover what they think we shall have to provide for in the future.

Mr. BORAH. I am speaking of taking care of those boys who will not have to be taken care of a year from now. They will be called hence long before that time unless they are taken care of at once.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator allude to those who are in the hospitals now?

Mr. BORAH. Those who are in and those who are unable to get in.

Mr. WARREN. Those who are unable to get in? Surely there is nothing to prevent them from coming in, for the money has been appropriated and is available for the purpose.

Mr. BORAH. They have not the hospitals to put them in.

Mr. WARREN. I have not the testimony before me, but the testimony of the Surgeon General is that no soldier is allowed to suffer. But they have to rent hospitals here and there, rent buildings which are not properly fitted for the purpose, and use the temporary structures erected during the war, which he very justly wants to replace with good hospitals.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, in view of what the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has just said, I wish to remind him that I was told some time ago that in one of the hospitals for the treatment of tubercular patients the rule was that patients could be kept there for a certain number of weeks for observation and treatment, and in the event that they were pronounced incurable, at the end of that time they would have to leave the hospital, and no provision was made for them thereafter. I do not know that that is true, but it came to me in such a way as to challenge my belief. If it is true, certainly all who believe in the principles of humanity would be in favor of taking care of them, and giving them the very best care possible.

Mr. WARREN. If that is true, as the Senator states, it is because of the acts of the board having the matter in charge, and not because of a lack of appropriations, or care on the part of Congress.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, does the Senator from Wyoming say that there has been no lack of appropriations to take care of the situation, with reference to ex-soldiers afflicted with disease, as those appropriations have been thought to be necessary by the department?

Mr. WARREN. Every dollar that has been asked for by the department for the care of soldiers has been furnished from time to time, going up to the 1st of July, and there are sums in some accounts that have not all been used, while other branches have caused deficiencies, and those deficiencies have been reported now to the House and are under consideration in the deficiency appropriation bill which will soon follow. This does not, however, cover the sundry civil bill, now being considered by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, as to hospitals, which are proposed to be cared for by the Senate and added to the bill.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, then the fault must lie elsewhere, because I have letters, and I presume many other Senators have letters, from soldiers who are in hospitals in which we ought not to keep horses, let alone men; buildings which are wholly unfitted for the use to which they are being put, with conditions surrounding those boys that we would not think of allowing to exist where an ordinary individual was suffering from ill health. I do not know where the fault lies. I only know that there is a condition of affairs which is most deplorable in regard to it. I can not search it out here now.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, assuming it to be true that 10,000 beds are urgently needed, and Congress does not supply the money, then where does the fault lie? With Congress, manifestly.

I ask the Senator to allow me to interrupt him until I read from the letter of the Surgeon General, which I read into the

RECORD. It is three days old. The Surgeon General wrote me as follows, and I read the concluding paragraph:

In round numbers 10,000 beds are urgently needed, of which the beds for tubercular and neuropsychiatric patients are of the greatest urgency. These additional beds will serve only to meet the present needs of the increase expected within the present fiscal year.

At the estimated cost of \$3,000 per bed, the 10,000 beds urgently needed would require an appropriation of \$30,000,000. The amount authorized by S. 4357—\$29,530,000—is approximately correct. From the best advice obtainable, it is not believed that the estimate of \$3,000 per bed for hospital construction is excessive. Indeed, unless there is a further decline in the cost of material and labor, it is doubted whether this estimated cost would be sufficient.

Mr. WARREN. We have the testimony of the Surgeon General, and he elaborates more fully the necessities to which the distinguished Senator from Arizona has alluded. What he proposes to do as soon as other buildings can be erected, which, of course, would take time, is to remove the patients entirely from a large share of buildings that are now used for hospitals, and hence the necessity, which the Senator mentions, for 10,000 beds.

Mr. BORAH. One thing seems to be quite evident as a mathematical proposition, that if we transfer the \$30,000,000 which is necessary to maintain an Army of 175,000 instead of an Army of 150,000, we will have money to take care of the men. That seems to be certain. Otherwise, if we were to take care of them, of course, it must be by increasing the taxes and increasing the burden. Assuming that we do take care of them, we can take care of them by this expenditure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] have shown beyond a shadow of doubt that we do not need a great standing Army to defend ourselves from foreign foes at this time. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has certainly shown that we do not need it for policing in our own country. It seems to me that at this time, when the whole world is talking about disarmament, the United States of America was never in a better position, and no nation was ever in so good a position, to set a good example to the world in the matter of disarmament by reducing our Army to the minimum. We have a chance now to show to the world that we have confidence in the disarmament idea. Will we do it? Have we the courage to do it? Have we the grit to stand against the beginning of a military oligarchy which we gave birth to in the Army reorganization act? I hope we have.

My understanding from the newspapers is that President-elect Harding, a distinguished former Member of this body, is about to base an agreement for a world association, as he calls it, upon the theory of disarmament, upon the plan of disarmament among the nations. If so, he deserves credit for having one good view about it, at least. It seems to me that his colleagues in the Senate, regardless of party affiliation, ought to uphold him in this high resolve. It is a great move in the right direction. We ought not only to aid him, but we ought to set the example in the very beginning, and we have the opportunity now in cutting down our Army to 150,000.

Let us see what the joint resolution before the Senate really provides. Last May Congress passed what was known as the Army reorganization bill, providing for an Army of 280,000 enlisted men and about 18,000 officers. I voted against that bill.

I thought that the organization was too large and that the number of enlisted men was too large. I did not think we needed such a large establishment as that provided for. I agreed with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] when he said he thought such an organization was top-heavy. I thought that adequately described the situation at the time. I think so now.

While the bill was passed providing for an Army of that size, when it came to appropriate for the number of men in the Army, Congress did not appropriate for 280,000 men. It appropriated for only 175,000 men. It was then argued that we would not get 280,000, nor even 175,000 men. Some Senators voted for the 175,000 because it was assumed that we would not get that many men. Mr. Secretary Baker came along and took the view that the law authorized and directed him to recruit the Army up to 280,000 men. Surely he had the right to take that view. There was the plain letter of the law authorizing him to recruit up to 280,000 men, and if Congress had not believed that we ought to have the 280,000 men it was perfectly natural that the query should arise in his mind, "Why did they put it in the law?" He is within the letter of the law when he endeavors to recruit it up to the larger number, and we all agree about that.

While that was put on the statute books, however, Congress, it is true, only appropriated for 175,000 men. That was not fair to the Secretary. It was not fair to the administration, and it was not fair to the Government.



While Mr. Baker and I disagree on many subjects, I do not think that he has violated the law with reference to recruiting the Army as he has been doing. What has he done? He recruited the Army until we now have some 230,000 men. Our friends say we must reduce it, and in that I heartily concur. The only difference between us is the extent of the reduction.

I think the joint resolution ought to pass, but what does it accomplish? Let us see what it accomplishes. We talk a great deal about reduction and how much the joint resolution is going to accomplish. We have 230,000 men now and if the joint resolution passes providing for a maximum of 175,000, in the course of about 16 months, under the amendment which was added to the bill on last Friday, it will be reduced to 175,000. In other words, the Army will be reduced in about 16 months the difference between 230,000 and 175,000. We will have an average number of about 200,000 after all in the Army when Congress has only appropriated for 175,000.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. Do I understand it to be the Senator's view that if the joint resolution is passed reducing the Army to 175,000 it will, in fact, be 16 months before it actually is reduced to that number?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is my judgment about the matter, and I will give the Senator the reason for my judgment.

Mr. POMERENE. Allow me to suggest that if that is true we ought to pass the joint resolution immediately.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator that we ought to pass the joint resolution immediately, and I think we ought to pass it providing for 150,000 enlisted men, so as to get it down within a reasonable time to something nearer what I believe to be the right number.

Mr. POMERENE. If it will take 16 months to reduce the Army to 175,000, how long will it take to reduce it to 150,000?

Mr. McKELLAR. It would take much longer, but at the same time we would be traveling in the right direction under the law. I wish to explain to the Senator from Ohio and to the Senate, before we go any further, just why it is going to be so. It was estimated that it would be reduced to 175,000 by next September. There are many branches of the service, notably, I think, the Infantry branch, the most important branch, which have not been recruited up to the number they would have under the 175,000 plan. We passed an amendment on Friday last providing that enlistments shall not be discontinued in those branches where 62½ per cent, I believe, as it is now, have not been secured; so that we will be continuing enlistments in those branches of the service as before, and we will only be reducing in those branches of the service where they already have an overplus. I think that it will take at least 16 months to bring the total number of the Army down under the joint resolution to 175,000 men.

It is argued that Mr. Secretary Baker and Gen. Pershing testified before the committee last Friday, and that their testimony very strongly supports the 175,000 plan. Unfortunately, I did not know that they were going to appear before the committee, and had an engagement at one of the departments, and so missed hearing them testify. But I have their testimony before me, and I wish to read Secretary Baker's position upon the matter. First, he is offered as a witness as to why we should accept the 175,000 figure. I read:

Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. We place in the Army reorganization bill a skeleton organization, and do you feel that skeleton organization will be impaired if the Army is reduced to 175,000 men?

Secretary BAKER. It will be impaired, Senator, but it will not be so sensibly impaired as to make it a very serious matter if it is a temporary thing. I understand the disposition of Congress, and I am in the profoundest sympathy with it. It is to economize, and I think the Army could get along with 175,000 until the present necessity for economy was somewhat relieved, but I think then it ought to be increased to 250,000 at least.

Senator JOHNSON. The disposition, I want to make plain to you, will be to make this reduction to 175,000, and I think I speak with accuracy in this regard, and the next thing that will be done will be not to increase it but to reduce it further. That is the disposition, I think, all along the line, and that is in the atmosphere.

Secretary BAKER. I think it is in the atmosphere. I think the world is strongly desirous of reducing the size of armies and reducing the size of armaments, and I know of no more wholesome or helpful thing to do than to bring that about.

In substance it will be noted this last statement contradicts his first statement, but is at war with his whole course of conduct in attempting to recruit the Army up to 280,000 men, as has been his professed purpose.

Here is the Secretary of War, who is recruiting the Army above the number that Congress has appropriated for. Congress appropriated for 175,000, and the Secretary of War has recruited up to 230,000 and is continuing recruiting day by day. He says that it will be unsafe to reduce it below 250,000. He

does not make any distinction between 175,000 and 150,000, or if he does, he takes it back in the very next sentence. He says that he knows of no more helpful thing to do than to bring it about. He regards the 280,000 provision in the Army reorganization bill as a mandate to him and has been acting upon that mandate. In one breath he says it ought to be carried out, and we ought to have at least 250,000 men, and in the next breath he says he knows of no more helpful thing to do than to reduce it. Is that testimony upon which we can act here? It seems to me not, but that we ought to act upon our own judgment.

Much has been said about Gen. Pershing's testimony, and I wish to call the attention of the Senate for a moment to his testimony. He never made the distinction that is being made here. Gen. Pershing said:

Well, I said in my reply to the Senator, I think at this time it should not be reduced below 200,000. It seems to me it is getting on dangerous ground if we undertake to do too much at this time, with the world's affairs as they appear to be now.

That is the excuse he gives for it. There is no specific reason given and there is no specific reason that exists in the country to-day for a big Army. It seems to me we ought to set an example to the other nations of the world. We have some 3,000,000 young men in the country splendidly trained now, amply able to defend the country almost on a moment's notice. We have their names and we can bring them into an army whenever we will. Congress is almost constantly in session. Why should we build up this large skeleton Army, as it is called? What necessity is there for it? We do not expect any war.

There is no nation on earth that could possibly think of coping with us on the field of battle or in battle on the seas. There is no reason in the world at this time which has been offered by anybody for an army of the size proposed. It has been suggested, rather inferentially, that there may be trouble in this country, but no real reason is given for this proposed trouble. The President elect of the United States is urging disarmament throughout the country; he has given out interviews in favor of disarmament. The Republican Senate say they are in favor of disarmament; the Republican Senate say they wish to reduce the Army. Well, if you are going to reduce it, why not reduce it in a manner which will do some good? Why make only a pretense at it? Under this joint resolution we are scarcely proposing to reduce the Army at all. It will take more than a year to reduce the Army to 175,000 men; and that is twice as many men as we had before the war, for we all know that we only had about 75,000 men on an average for a number of years before the war, in our Army, and hardly that many. We did not need them, and we do not need them now.

I understand that while the President of the United States agreed at the peace conference to leave 7,500 men on our portion of the line on the Rhine in Germany, to-day we have now some 14,800 men there, and have had that number of men there all the time—about double the number of men the President agreed should stay there. Why are those men kept there? What necessity is there for the excess number? The Secretary of War in this very statement testifies that the department has recruited men and sent them over there to replace some of the men whose enlistments expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think the Senator from Tennessee can not have read the testimony.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have the testimony before me and am reading from it. I will turn to the testimony and see if I have made a mistake. I desire to correct it if I have, but my understanding is as I have stated.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The statement was made perfectly plain to the committee, and if the Senator had been present he would have known it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to have the Senator from New York explain it. I wish to be corrected if I am wrong. But I have the testimony before me.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It was agreed upon while the peace conference was in session that 7,500 or 8,000 men should be the American contribution for the army of occupation on the Rhine. After that agreement was made the allied powers came to an agreement to send forces to Silesia, and our administration, for reasons thought good by the President, I assume, decided to contribute 5,000 men to police a referendum or a public election in Silesia.

That force was sent from the United States. When it reached Europe it was halted and not allowed to go to Silesia, but ended upon the Rhine. As a matter of fact, as the terms of enlist-

ment of the men now stationed under Gen. Allen on the Rhine expire they are brought home and no men are sent to take their places.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to ask the Senator if it is not true that there are some 14,000 or 15,000 men now on the Rhine?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can give the exact number. There are now on the Rhine 14,800 men.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now desire to read the testimony which I have before me. Senator Knox asked the question:

How many have we in Europe?

Gen. PERSHING. I think something like 12,000.

Secretary BAKER. I think 14,000.

Senator KNOX. How are they located?

Gen. PERSHING. They are all located upon the Rhine. The original number to be left there was 7,500; that was agreed upon in conference when the President was there. It was about as small an amount as could be organized, to be given any sort of balance. They have a little artillery and some cavalry. I think they have organized the cavalry since, but with auxiliary troops and everything necessary there are a fixed number at 7,500. After that there were some 5,000 sent over, originally intended for service in Silesia, but were never sent to Silesia. I think they were stopped on the Rhine and made a part of the command under Gen. Allen, whose headquarters were at Coblenz; and I presume that has been followed up by recruitments sent over from time to time, making now something like 14,000 men.

Mr. President, instead of taxing the American people for 25,000 additional men at this time, at a cost of some \$35,000,000 or \$40,000,000—because that is what we are proposing to do when we adopt the proposition to fix the number at 175,000 men instead of fixing the number at 150,000—why can we not bring the 7,500 additional men now on the Rhine back to this country and use them in our Army here and thus save the American people this great expense?

Mr. FLETCHER. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. I desire to say that the testimony shows that the United States is not put to a dollar of expense by reason of the maintenance of the Army on the Rhine or for the pay of the men.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad the Senator has brought that fact forward, because I desire in just a moment to explain what the testimony shows about that. The testimony does not uphold the statement of the Senator.

Mr. FLETCHER. The testimony also shows that those men are coming home very rapidly, so that within the next month or two—I forget the exact figures, but I remember a statement was made as to enlistments expiring, and so forth—they will be coming home at the rate of something like 1,000 a month, or even more than that.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, sir; that is always the excuse given; that excuse is always ready; that we are going to do something in the future; that we are going to reduce the Army, for instance, but we do not do it. The joint resolution is in large part exactly of that character. It says that we are going to reduce the number to 175,000, but we shall not do it for a long, long time. Now, let me read on a little further.

Secretary BAKER. But they have got as high as 16,000 at one time by refilling the vacancies—

We are recruiting in this country for the purpose of keeping 15,000 men on the Rhine, when the contract which the President made at Versailles was that we should keep but 7,500 men there.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Why does not the Senator desire to be fair?

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, I desire to be fair. I am fair. I am reading from the testimony.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator is not reading all of it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will read it all.

Mr. WADSWORTH. He would not make the last statement if he had read it all.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will read it all here and now, for I have nothing before me except the testimony given to the committee.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Very well; read it all. Even, I may say, a member of the Republican majority has to ask fairness in the treatment of a Democratic Secretary of War.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know about that, but I will stop long enough here to say that I have my doubts about it. The joint resolution advocated by the Senator is a criticism of the Secretary of War; the joint resolution reported out by the Senator from New York is a direct criticism of the Secretary's action in recruiting the Army as he has recruited it. By the way, I wish to say that I am not in the attitude of a critic of Mr. Baker, the Secretary of War. He has legal authority to recruit, and every Senator knows it. The Senator brought forth a bill here

last year which, in words, gave him authority to recruit up to 280,000 men. I have defended Secretary Baker as to his authority. I am opposed to his exercise of that authority. Now, this joint resolution is a criticism of Secretary Baker for doing what the Republican majority, in language which could not be mistaken, authorized and directed him to do.

However, I hold no brief for Secretary Baker. I owe him no defense. I do not recall his ever having considered the interests of my State when they have come before him. In the six years he has been Secretary, Tennessee has received short shift at his hands. So that I am all the more free to uphold him when he is right and criticize him when I believe he is wrong. In exercising the authority to recruit the Army up to 280,000, as you authorized him, he is clearly right. In the policy of carrying out your directions he is clearly wrong.

I now read:

Secretary BAKER. But they have got as high as 16,000 at one time by refilling the vacancies; but that has been suspended for some months. As enlistments—

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is what I wanted to call to the attention of the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am reading that statement. I had simply not got to it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But the Senator made a statement to the Senate before he read it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am reading the whole thing; I am not going to be unfair to any man, if I know it, whether he be an officer, or Secretary, or whoever he may be.

As enlistments expire the men return to this country, and no fresh replacements are being sent over.

He does not say when that was; he says "recently."

Mr. WADSWORTH. He said "for some months."

Mr. McKELLAR. "For some months"; yes.

Senator NEW. I see that it is proposed to bring home all but about 8,000 men. I saw a newspaper announcement to that effect yesterday. On what was that based?

Secretary BAKER. It was based on the expiration of enlistments. As Gen. Pershing said, the original force was something like 7,500 men, but while the Peace Congress was still in session in Paris it was arranged that a part of Gen. Pershing's army should be retained for service in Silesia. These troops had been there a long time, and instead of retaining them there, with their period of enlistment, we brought them home and sent another contingent—

I will stop long enough there to call the Senator's attention to the fact that he said that these troops were intended for Silesia. They originally were intended for Silesia. Then they came home, but others were sent to the Rhine to take their places, according to the Secretary of War.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I stated the fact with absolute accuracy. I said that 5,000 men were sent from this country to serve in Silesia, but were stopped on the Rhine and did not go to Silesia.

Mr. McKELLAR. But the Senator did not state all of the fact, because those troops were sent back and another 5,000 were sent over to the Rhine to take the place of the first 5,000, according to Mr. Baker's testimony. I read further from the testimony:

Those troops had been there a long time, and instead of retaining them there, with their period of enlistment we brought them home and sent another contingent of about 5,000 over to take their places. They were attached to Gen. Allen's command at Coblenz to keep it up to the full strength. As their commissions and enlistments—

I assume that he means 16,000, or more than double the strength that it was originally intended to retain there by the President at Versailles.

As their commissions and enlistments are expiring, they are all coming home, and we are not sending any more replacements; so that by about the middle of May the force will get down to what it was originally designed to be.

Senator NEW. That was my understanding of it, and it was in order to develop that that I asked that question. The whole thing comes down to the point, then, that you are simply not replacing the expiring enlistments?

Secretary BAKER. That is right, sir.

Senator NEW. These men are coming home individually and as casuals, and there is no fixed purpose to bring home any considerable number of them in one outfit?

Secretary BAKER. That is right, Senator.

Now we come to the matter of pay. I shall read what the witnesses testified, because I myself do not recall exactly what was said.

The CHAIRMAN. What portion of the expense does Germany pay?

Secretary BAKER. It pays all of it, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Including the pay of the troops?

Senator WARREN. It agrees to pay it.

Secretary BAKER. Well, they sent us some money; I do not know how much.

The CHAIRMAN. The pay of the officers and men?

Secretary BAKER. Yes, sir; that is my understanding.

Gen. PERSHING. Oh, yes; I think it was paid up to about September, 1919. I do not know what they have done since then.

Secretary BAKER. I have had checks since then, and Gen. Allen reported not long ago that he had marks enough on hand to pay all the expenses of his force.



Senator BECKHAM. I would like to ask Gen. Pershing, in line with Senator Johnson's question, what he thinks of the proposed reduction of the Army to 150,000?

Gen. PERSHING. Well, I said in my reply to the Senator, I think at this time it should not be reduced below 200,000 men. It seems to me it is getting on dangerous ground if we undertake to do too much at this time with the world's affairs as they appear to be now.

That is the testimony of Gen. Pershing in regard to the size of the Army.

Mr. President, it does not seem to me that the testimony of either Mr. Baker or Gen. Pershing is important as to this question now before the Senate. Both are asking for more than 200,000. Neither asking for the 175,000 men.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, even if they are correct, we are not following them. Gen. Pershing says we should not reduce the Army below 200,000, but the committee proposes to disregard his recommendations.

Mr. McKELLAR. A majority of the committee propose to disregard Gen. Pershing's recommendations, and all the committee propose to disregard the recommendations of the Secretary of War. The statement has been made that I am criticizing the Secretary of War. I am stating the fact when I say that the whole committee desires to disregard his recommendations, and apparently his testimony is being used simply to prove what he has done is wrong. It is a strange defense of the Secretary. The purpose of the pending joint resolution is to disregard the Secretary of War in toto. He has brought the Army up to 230,000 men and is recruiting it still further, and says it ought not to be less than 250,000 men.

Mr. President, it seems to me it is our duty to act upon our knowledge and judgment in the matter, in accordance with the time-honored traditions of this Republic, for the benefit of all the people, and save this large difference in the cost of the Army. Thirty-five million dollars or \$40,000,000 is still a considerable sum of money. If properly used it would do much good.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will pardon me for a moment, we all know that the actual difference in effectiveness between a skeleton Army of 150,000 men and a skeleton Army of 175,000 could not be told by any expert.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield right there?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield. I beg the Senator's pardon. I must yield to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] first. He first interrupted.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is right on that point that I want to ask the Senator a question, with the indulgence of both the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Montana. In view of that fact and a consideration of the subject generally, and in view of the further fact, as stated by the Senator from Tennessee, that the reduction to 175,000 can not possibly be accomplished before the first or last of September, does not the Senator think that we might dispose of this matter by making the reduction suggested by the Senator from New York and proceed to other business? Otherwise, the end of September may come before we finally dispose of it.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true. I am willing to take a reduction to 175,000 if we can not get the 150,000, but I am very much in favor of reducing it to the lower number; and I want to say to the Senator from Arkansas that while the thirty or forty million dollars which would be saved is not a matter of very much moment to many Senators it is, to my humble way of thinking about it, a very important matter. I would a thousand times rather vote to devote this thirty or forty million dollars to looking after and protecting and keeping up the maimed, wounded, and tuberculosis-cursed boys who have already been serving their Government in the Army, who are now without proper hospital service, as has been shown here, than to add to the Army this additional number of 25,000 men that are wholly useless at this time. I think the Senator from Arkansas is mistaken in saying that we are losing time or wasting time when we are endeavoring, first, to lower the tax burdens upon the people of this country and also in endeavoring to use this money for the benefit of those who are entitled to it, who have already given most of their lives to their country.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. But the point I am making is that, according to the Senator's own argument, we could make this reduction now to 175,000, and before that is concluded we could give further consideration to the subject, if necessary, and provide for any other reduction that may be deemed advisable; but if we continue to debate the subject indefinitely there is likely to be no action.

Mr. McKELLAR. But why take two bites at a cherry when you can take it with one just as easily?

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MYERS. I wanted to make a remark in connection with the suggestion made by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] a few minutes ago. Reference was made to the fact that Gen. Pershing opposes any reduction below 200,000. That is true; and yet while it is his opinion that the number of enlisted men should not be reduced below 200,000, he says it could be reduced to 175,000 without totally impairing the framework on which the Army is founded, but that if you go below 175,000 you destroy the foundation upon which the reorganized Army was built and would have to do it all over again.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did Gen. Pershing say what the foundation or framework was? I do not find it in his testimony here. He merely makes that as an excuse for not reducing it. Why, Gen. Pershing, from his point of view, would not reduce the Army at all. He would increase it. He is a military man, and one of the greatest in the world, but, of course, he looks at all these questions from a military standpoint.

Mr. MYERS. He gave an explanation of it further on, about so many units and regiments being required on which to expand, and that if we went below 175,000 we would not have them.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; but when we come to look into what has been done under the present Army reorganization act we find that the staff units of the Army have been enlisted to a greater strength than they ought to have been enlisted to, whereas the infantry, or fighting units, have not been enlisted up to their full strength.

Mr. MYERS. I know that Gen. Pershing says in effect that if Congress sees fit we can reduce the Army to 175,000, although against his judgment, without destroying the foundation on which it is constructed, but that if we go below 175,000 we are virtually destroying the foundation on which the house is built. He is a military expert, and I am willing to take his judgment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no. The Senator is mistaken about that. He does not say that.

Mr. MYERS. He did not use those words, but that was the effect of what he said.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; if you want to follow the advice of Gen. Pershing, do not vote for 175,000, because he is opposed to it. He says you will destroy those units if you bring the Army down below 200,000.

Mr. MYERS. There is more there on the subject. He says that you destroy it all the more if you go below 175,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. He does not say that. That may be the argument which the Senator has in his own mind, but Gen. Pershing does not say that.

Mr. MYERS. That was advanced while he was testifying, either by him or by some Senator, and he assented to it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Perhaps so, but this record does not show it.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. DIAL. Would it not be well if we could take some steps to stop the recruiting of officers as well as to stop the recruiting of enlisted men?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am not prepared to agree to that. The Army reorganization act, as I recall, provides for about 18,000 officers, and they have commissioned up to date about 14,000, and there are now about 4,000 less than the number required. I do not know whether or not the Secretary takes the same view about decreasing the number of officers that he does about decreasing the number of men. I think they have a rule now that officers can only come up from second lieutenants.

Mr. DIAL. That is on the assumption, though, that we are going to have an Army of about 280,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. The 18,000 was on the assumption—I am giving round numbers, of course—that we would have an Army of 280,000 men.

Mr. DIAL. Now, if we should reduce the Army down to 150,000 or 175,000, we would need less officers than we would for an Army of 280,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator may think so; but I think it is very much more important to have a larger number of officers proportionately than of men, for the reason that we can bring men into the Army very rapidly, while it takes some time, it takes years, to train officers. I am rather inclined to think that we ought not to reduce the number of officers.

Mr. DIAL. I agree to that proposition as a rule, but it does seem to me that there is a very great disproportion.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I regret very much that the Senate has seen fit to change its views since last Friday. On last Friday, by a substantial majority, the Senate held that 150,000 men in the Army were enough. This morning, by a very much larger majority, the Senate went the other way. I regret it very much. I hope that the amendment for 175,000 may be defeated, and that we may have 150,000 in our Army.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I am very anxious—as others are, no doubt—to reach a conclusion of this discussion, and I shall not delay the action upon it. I do, however, feel called upon to say just a word in view of the remarks which have been made to the effect that we could use the amount of money required over and above the amount necessary to provide for 150,000 to 175,000 enlisted men for taking care of the disabled and the injured.

Of course, it would seem unnecessary to say, although the arguments made rather call for an expression of that kind, that no Member of this body who favors enlistment up to 175,000 men is in favor of decreasing in any amount whatsoever the provisions which ought to be made for disabled or wounded or otherwise incapacitated men by reason of their service. On the other hand, I favor taking care of those men to the limit, and I believe Congress will do it. The country demands it, considerations of humanity require it, and everyone who favors this provision for the Army certainly favors taking care of the incapacitated and the disabled men in every respect whatsoever, no matter to what extent it may be necessary to go.

We must make provision for those men. It is our duty to do it, and we will do it. I have not any question about that. It makes no difference whether the joint resolution provides for 175,000 or 150,000 men; that has nothing to do with the question of taking care of the incapacitated and the disabled. That is going to be done, anyhow.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. According to the testimony that was read a while ago, it is very far from being done at present. There are a great many tuberculosis patients that are not being cared for.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understand that already provision of a temporary character has been made for taking care of those men, and that further provision will be made as the bills are considered by the committees which are now handling them. That situation will be met independently of any question as to what is done with regard to this joint resolution and the number of enlisted men provided for hereafter in the Army.

The arguments made by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] lead us to this: Why have any Army at all? If you can save \$30,000 by striking off 25,000 men, why not save \$50,000 by striking off 40,000 men, and why not save a million dollars by striking off a few more men, and finally we get to the point where we do not need to have any Army at all, and we will take the whole amount of money and use it for constructive purposes.

Of course, you can do that if you want to; but one Government after another has been committing suicide for the last four years. Austria-Hungary committed suicide. I suppose we can do it if we want to do it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that I know he does not want to misstate what I have said.

Mr. FLETCHER. No.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not in favor of having no Army. I am in favor of a proper Army. This Army will be twice as large as we had before the war if it is reduced to 150,000. The Senator talks about Austria committing suicide. The Senator knows that the reason why Austria had to commit suicide was because for many generations she maintained one of the greatest standing armies in Europe.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I was about to remark that Austria-Hungary committed suicide by increasing her army, not by reducing it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why, of course.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for one moment?

Mr. FLETCHER. Austria-Hungary committed suicide by a very foolish, absurd, ridiculous, asinine move or policy—

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, we do not want to follow it.

Mr. FLETCHER. Not by reason of having an army, but by reason of undertaking to put the world on fire. There are various ways of committing suicide; but if the country is dead, it is immaterial how it got there.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me just for a brief statement?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Tennessee has just stated that the Army proposed in the amendment carrying 150,000 enlisted men would be twice as large as the Army of the United States prior to the war.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. No doubt the Senator will recall that under the national defense act passed in August, 1916, the Army, prior to our entering into the war, was augmented to 202,000 officers and men, or approximately that number, and that from the beginning to the end of the war those in charge of the Government were execrated by the people of this Nation for failing to provide for a sufficient Army, for a total disregard of what they termed necessary preparedness. Now, Mr. President, we are still technically in a state of war; and I respectfully suggest that especially those—I do not now refer to the Senator from Tennessee, but to other Senators who have participated in this debate—especially does it not lie in the mouths of those Senators who have opposed this Government entering into any relations for the preservation of the future peace of the world with other Governments to say that under the conditions as they now exist this Government ought not to have an Army of 175,000 men.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, of course, I am familiar with the Army reorganization act of 1916, in which the authority was given to raise an Army of some 225,000 men; but, as a matter of fact, it was by voluntary enlistment, and for the six years preceding the war, I would say, the Army on an average was very much nearer to 60,000 than 70,000, and it is now four times, or more than four times that number.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator; but I will be through in just a moment.

Mr. OWEN. I merely wanted to make the observation that when the authority was given to increase the Army the world was then ablaze with war.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course.

Mr. OWEN. Moreover, with the destruction of the great military establishments of Europe the threat which hung over the world of a possible world war has been almost entirely removed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Absolutely.

Mr. OWEN. And the whole world is now trying to get back to a basis of disarmament in order to relieve the people of the world from the gigantic taxation which is consuming the taxpayers of the world. I am myself very much in favor of the smaller number.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think we ought to set an example to the world by going ahead and reducing our own Army.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Oklahoma has spoken just as if the world were at peace. He has referred to the fact that at the time the United States augmented its Army, in the manner and to the extent I spoke of a moment ago, the world was ablaze. I call his attention to the fact that the fire has not been extinguished yet. The United States has not yet made peace with her enemies, and war still continues along many battle fronts, bitter and desolating warfare. It is within the knowledge of every Senator present that the foreign relations of this Government respecting some of the great powers of the earth are, to say the least, not the most amicable that could be desired or that could be established.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I do not look for any war; I do not expect that we are going to have any conflict with any country in the world; but, at the same time, I am not in favor of doing away with the framework, the skeleton, if you please, of a standing Army. I know the Senator from Tennessee is not in favor of doing away with the Army, either. I merely stated a moment ago that his argument led to that sort of a conclusion. But I am not in favor of so crippling the Army as to make it ineffective, to make it worthless and useless in case there should be trouble. It would be unwise, it seems to me, to so limit the number of enlisted men in the Army that we could not carry on any training at all; that we could not keep up the necessary additions to the arms or branches which the World War has demonstrated we should have made, namely, the Chemical Warfare branch, the Air Service, and the Motor Transport Service, all of them calling for men in addition to those required in the Regular Army before this war. I am not in favor of abolishing those and preventing this work in connection with what may happen in the future in the air and under the sea. I say, it



would be folly for us to discontinue those branches of the Army.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator holds those views, he ought to oppose this bill entirely, for the reason that the best thought in the Army, of the leading officers of the Army, the Secretary of War, and all the important generals of the Army, who appeared before Congress last spring, was that the organization they proposed was the least organization, both of officers and men, consistent with the safety of the country. If the Senator thinks that 150,000 men will destroy it, by the same process of reasoning he must come to the conclusion that 175,000 will almost equally destroy it, and he should not vote for the joint resolution now. If I had the views about it the Senator has, I would certainly vote against the joint resolution.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understand, of course, about the testimony taken before the committee some months ago. But conditions have changed. Conditions are changing almost every day. It may be that six months from now I will vote to reduce the Army further. We can not foresee what may happen in that time. It may be that in six months from now we will vote to increase it, and the Senator from Tennessee will be ready to vote with us on that proposition.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will vote for it whenever it is necessary.

Mr. FLETCHER. But we do know now that conditions have changed since the Army reorganization bill was first submitted and hearings were had upon it. I was referring to these additional branches by way of comparing the 150,000, as proposed to be provided now, with the prewar number of about 103,000. That is about the comparison. If you add those I have mentioned, which we have seen fit to add, and will continue the Motor Transport Service, the Chemical Warfare Service, and the Air Service you will just about place the Army on the prewar footing. I think we ought to stand for that. I am therefore in favor of the joint resolution providing 175,000 enlisted men.

It may be material here to read in this connection a telegram which I have just received. Many of us have received similar telegrams, and this is a sample of the letters and telegrams which have come to me in this connection. The telegram is from Chicago, dated January 15, and is as follows:

In connection with newspaper publicity relative to proposed standing army, we ask that consideration be given to reports of Secretary of War Baker and Gen. Pershing, both stating that 200,000 is the minimum on which our Army can be successfully administered. We advocate nothing less than this figure.

THE CHICAGO ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,  
ARMY AND NAVY COMMITTEE,  
CHARLES S. DEWEY, *Chairman*,  
GEORGE M. SPANGLER, *Secretary*.

Mr. President, I am very anxious to have a conclusion reached regarding the joint resolution, and I shall not detain the Senate longer, although I might add something to what I have already said in support of the measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendments made in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Assistant Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Beckham	Hale	McKellar	Sheppard
Borah	Harris	McLean	Simmons
Brandagee	Harrison	McNary	Smith, Ariz.
Calder	Hefflin	Moses	Smith, Ga.
Capper	Henderson	Myers	Smith, Md.
Cott	Hitchcock	Nelson	Smoot
Curtis	Johnson, Calif.	New	Spencer
Dial	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Sterling
Dillingham	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Sutherland
Fall	Jones, Wash.	Owen	Swanson
Fernald	Kellogg	Page	Trammell
Fletcher	Kenyon	Phelan	Underwood
Frelinghuysen	Keyes	Pittman	Wadsworth
Gay	King	Poindexter	Walsh, Mass.
Gerry	Kirby	Pomerene	Walsh, Mont.
Glass	Knox	Ransdell	Warren
Gooding	La Follette	Reed	Williams
Gronna	McCumber	Robinson	Willis

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-two Senators have answered the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, when the notice for reconsideration was given by me last Friday, the Senate was not in possession of the information which had been given to the Committee on Military Affairs by Gen. Pershing and Secretary Baker, and the reconsideration was sought in order that the information given by the commanding general of the Army and the Secretary of War might be in the possession of the Senate before final action would be taken. I simply desire briefly to

state what that testimony was. The testimony in part was as follows:

Senator BECKHAM. I would like to ask Gen. Pershing, in line with Senator JOHNSON'S question, what he thinks of the proposed reduction of the Army to 150,000.

Gen. PERSHING. Well, I said in my reply to the Senator, I think, at this time it should not be reduced below 200,000. It seems to me it is getting on dangerous ground if we undertake to do too much at this time, with the world's affairs as they appear to be now.

Again, on page 13 of the testimony, Senator JOHNSON asked:

We would like, Gen. Pershing, to have your view about this temporary reduction.

Gen. PERSHING. It seems to me that at the moment there should be no very radical reduction made. I am of the opinion that conditions in the world do not warrant us in making too great a reduction. I should not like to see it reduced below 200,000 at the present time.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] said that 150,000 would represent about double the strength of the Army before the war. The chairman of the committee, Senator WADSWORTH, at that meeting, in answer to a suggestion of that kind said:

The reduction to 150,000 men should be considered in the light of the new obligations imposed upon the Army rather than in the light of the strength of the Regular Army of 1916.

That makes a very considerable difference. There should be at least 10,000 men in the Air Service. We authorized 16,000. There are 8,000 in the Philippine Scouts. There are 18,000 extra. There are 1,200 in the chemical-warfare department, which makes a total of 19,200. There are 1,800 in the Porto Rico regiment. That makes a total of over 21,000 men right there.

Secretary BAKER. And those were previously extra.

The CHAIRMAN. Previously they were not in the Regular Army.

Secretary of War Baker urged 250,000 men as a minimum.

So the war has brought new methods of warfare, chemical warfare and warfare growing out of the Air Service, and the Army of to-day, in the light of experiences of the war, of course, is not the same organization that it was before the war. In order to have the same strength in the Army, we must have numerically a greater Army to-day to be on a parity with our military strength before the war.

The high command, if I may so call it, of our Army, the respected General of the Army, in unequivocal terms, has stated that 200,000 would be the lowest number of enlisted men with which we might consider ourselves in the possession of a skeleton army with power to expand. If that is true, the Senate ought to be advised of it.

Some one wrote a book not a long time ago called "The Valor of Ignorance," a very illuminating title. I think it might bear critically upon Members of this body who, without any familiarity with war or the organization of an army, certainly not in the field, have ventured to express views diametrically opposed to the view of our respected commander of the Army, whose opinion certainly is entitled to the greatest weight. In that book, *The Valor of Ignorance*, which conveyed the idea that we are valorous because we do not know the danger, it was clearly pointed out that we required an army because there was danger.

The writer of that book—an American—was a general in the Chinese Army, and had his collegiate training at Leland Stanford Junior University. He was a man of action and a man of letters, and he clearly foresaw all the dangers into which this country was about to be precipitated. He knew the necessity of having an adequate defense. In the book he gives information which leads us to believe, coming from him as a distinguished strategist, that there would be no difficulty in landing an army upon the American coast, notwithstanding the assertions here to-day that it would be impossible to make a landing upon the Pacific coast of America. If it is at all possible to land upon the Pacific coast of America, we must not only have a navy as a first line of defense, but we must have a garrisoned coast, where we have an adequate number of men to man our shore batteries.

We are not in a position to-day to take advantage of the opportunities we possess for the public defense of Alaska, the Canal Zone, Guam, the islands of the Caribbean. In the island of Hawaii there is an inadequate garrison. During the war we had to strip the Hawaiian Island garrison and substitute a national guard composed one-half of Japanese. The island of Guam requires a garrison, more so to-day since the Japanese have taken possession of the Mariana, Marshall, and Caroline Islands surrounding Guam, which has destroyed it in the eyes of military men as a strategical point for the United States and brought Japan 2,000 miles closer to our shore. Japan has fortified a great island nearer her coast which our ships are not permitted to approach, a veritable Gibraltar.

When it is stated that there is no danger in the Pacific which would justify adequate preparedness, I will call the attention of the Senate to the fact that it has developed that at this very moment there is a controversy, involving considerable danger,

between the powers of Europe and Asia on the one hand and the United States on the other, with respect to the island of Yap, vitally necessary for our communication with the Far East and which we were promised in the conference at Versailles, according to the President. If that is vital for our communication, perhaps it will be necessary for us to insist upon the redemption of the promise made to the President of the United States by the Japanese at that time. At any rate, whatever may happen, it will persevere and cause friction.

I am not speaking of the California situation to-day, because it is a long story, although the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], I believe, belittled the danger which arises from the presence of Japanese in California. I need only to direct your attention to the fact that within a week the Legislature of the State of California, both in the senate and in the assembly, by a unanimous vote informed the Federal Government that should it interfere, by treaty or otherwise, in invalidating the alien land law of California barring oriental aliens from the soil, or if it endeavored to confer citizenship upon orientals resident in California a situation would be created which, I am sure, would be both painful and disagreeable for the country at large.

The memorial itself is on the way and will be published in the Record in a few days and will speak for itself.

I do not know what recourse California would have should her vital interests be sacrificed to the maintaining of a so-called "friendship" with a country that is disputing every foot of ground in the Pacific; with a country that holds no friendly feeling toward the United States, which it regards as an aggressor.

I call attention to this Associated Press dispatch from Tokyo: JAPAN EXPECTS UNITED STATES TREATY TO KILL LAND LAW—TOKYO DIET TOLD CALIFORNIA MEASURE WILL BE NULLIFIED.

[By the Associated Press.]

TOKYO, December 24, 1920.

Addressing preliminary meetings of the diet here to-day, Viscount Uchida, the foreign minister, expressed the opinion that a new Japanese-American treaty will be concluded, leading to nullification of the California land law. He said he expected such action to result from the negotiations which have been in progress at Washington between Ambassador Morris and the Japanese ambassador.

Ambassadors, he said, were making efforts to obtain an understanding with the Senate to obtain passage of the treaty, but if the negotiations fail a formal protest would be lodged.

Answering interpellations, M. Uchida said the negotiations were proceeding on the understanding that such a treaty would override the State laws.

Texas the other day received only two families of Japanese who had acquired land and who were about to settle in the Rio Grande Valley. What happened? This is significant. It was not a vigilance committee that waited upon the Japanese. It was a great law-abiding and law-enforcing body of men, none less than representatives of the American Legion. In their two conventions at Minneapolis and at Cleveland, nation wide, the American Legion resolved that the Japanese question must be settled upon the lines demanded by California, and that great organization of fighting men is behind the cause advocating the exclusion of the Japanese, barring them from the ownership of the soil and the enjoyment of the voting privilege. I was rejoiced to see it, because the Congress, while it might, which I sincerely doubt, ignore the petition of California, a State afflicted and most familiar with the subject, would not ignore the petition of that great body of patriotic Americans who established the prestige of United States arms in the World War.

We must bear in mind, therefore, that this is as much an American question as it is a California question, and if there is any danger in that situation it is idle for Senators to say we are in a time of profound peace. War is going on all over the world. Gen. Pershing knows that. He knew our inadequate Army before he was sent into Mexico with an insufficient force which made our service ridiculous and brought discredit upon our country by failing to make an effective strike.

I am told that with a knowledge of that expedition to Mexico, the very peons of Mexico look upon us with a great deal of contempt. If we ever entered Mexico, we should have finally established the purposes for which we entered Mexico, but we have gone on in a policy of vacillation; our councils have been pacific; but the nations of the world have imposed on our pacifism, and the only way to win their respect, I believe, is to have a strong Army and a strong Navy until the dangers are passed, not to strike but to be ready to strike.

The times are out of joint. The world is really at war to-day, and there are potentialities in the immediate future which are alarming. That has been indicated by discussion in the Committee on Foreign Relations, in the Committees on Naval and Military Affairs, and in the press. There is no peace in the world to-day, and the United States technically is still at war.

In view of these circumstances, I lay great stress upon the testimony of Gen. Pershing. I think it would be a mistake to weaken our Army organization. As the chairman of the Com-

mittee on Military Affairs may possibly tell the Senate, we have an organization of an Army on the basis of 240,000 enlisted men, and if we cut it down to 175,000 it will make the task difficult, but far more difficult if we cut it down to 150,000. So, in order to maintain an organization that is worthy of the name, upon which a greater organization, if necessary, may be built, it seems to me extremely desirable that the recommendations of the committee be adopted by the Senate establishing the Army strength at 175,000 enlisted men.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have listened, as everybody always does listen, with a great deal of intensive interest to the utterances of the Senator from California. It is not always given to all of us to regard his conclusions with any degree of tolerable respect, but it is always given to us to regard his earnestness and his zeal for the Pacific slope with that degree of respect which a sectional man, as I am, regards a sectional effort of another man, such as he is.

The Senator tells us that the Legislature of California has just "given notice" that it will defy any treaties of the United States that do this, that, or the other thing; and he tells us that it would be an awfully "disagreeable thing" if an impasse came between the Legislature of California and the United States Government. My memory goes back—historically, not individually—to a period when 11 different Southern States read riot acts like that to the Federal Government, and the result was, as predicted, very disagreeable, very, indeed.

The State of the Senator from California is not really proposing a new secession or a new nullification, or a new war against the Union. But if he did not mean that, he did not mean much of anything; he was simply "vaporizing in the air." Our people, when we said that we meant all that, really did mean it and we intended to fight. We did fight, we fought for four years, and we died, a whole lot of us—not myself amongst them, but some of us, you understand, amongst our ancestors.

The Senator does not mean a word of that. California is not going to declare war against the Union. She is not going to nullify anything. She is not going to secede. She is not going to nullify any treaty. She is not going to defy any laws of the United States. She has not the slightest idea of doing it to-day, and the Senator knows it. But he bases his entire argument in favor of the possibility of war between Japan and the United States upon the action of the Legislature of California and the possible counteraction of Japan. He knows the Government of the United States is not going to be bulldozed by the Legislature of California—I will not say bulldozed; I mean influenced. It will not be influenced in the slightest degree. It might have been under a Democratic administration and with the weakness of Democracy, but it can not be under the plutocratic administration which is just coming in with the strength of plutocracy that insists that everything should be surrendered to money. Even at the beginning of the Civil War if plutocracy had been in command, we never would have had any war. They would have said, Let us trade together and let us have peace.

The Senator from California tells us in the next place that there is "war all over the world." Yes, everywhere except in the United States and everywhere except between the United States and another party. Why does the Senator want to say "there is war all over the world" as an inducement for us to build up a great big Army to keep off enemies? Where are the enemies? I ask the Senator from California now to rise in his place and tell me where are the enemies.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi, of course, means enemies of the United States. It is very hard to declare as enemies people who, in the language of diplomacy, are on friendly terms with the United States. I do not believe that the Japanese Government is, in a true sense, friendly to the interests of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Nor do I.

Mr. PHELAN. I know that she resents the attitude of the United States on the subject of racial inequality, and I can understand the Japanese position. She simply says, "We are a world power, and our nationals are entitled to as much consideration as are the nationals of any other country." That, if acceded to, would bear very hard upon the Pacific coast, because, as in the case of the Hawaiian Islands, the Pacific coast would soon pass to the political and actual control of orientals. If we conferred citizenship upon those who reside there, it would simply speed that day.

So there is a real situation there. However, I did not say, as the Senator from Mississippi has repeated—and I think he is mistaken—that the Legislature of California has defied the Federal Government. There is no note of defiance, but I referred to a memorial adopted by a sovereign State.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not yield to the Senator from California to make a speech. I yielded to him to answer a question,



Mr. PHELAN. Then, I will answer the question in one word more. I would say that we are also on terms of amity and peace with the Republic of Mexico, but they are passing laws which are prejudicial to our nationals there, and there was an incipient revolution there the other day. There is a constant menace to us upon the Mexican border. It is easy to recall the raid at Columbus.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I asked the Senator from California to point out a possible enemy of the United States, meaning by it, as you must have understood and as every Member of the Senate must have understood, any power anywhere that had the will to attack, had the power to attack, and would attack the United States. The Senator has failed to answer the question. He knows as well as I do that Japan neither dares nor will attack the United States because of any legislation which may be passed in California.

Mr. PHELAN. Russia once thought so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, well, never mind about that. I was not going off on side issues of one description or another.

The Senator from California tells us that the peons of Mexico despise us. Is not that awful? Just think of it! The peons of Mexico despise the American Republic because we have not properly asserted our dignity; because we have not gone down and spanked a lot of little children who are playing around in the back yard and are shooting bows and arrows at us and spitting fire at us now and then, chewing gum and squirting out of their upper lips at us. Is not that awful? The peons of Mexico despise us! Let us raise an immense, great big Army because the peons of Mexico despise us!

What would happen to the peons of Mexico if we should let loose the State of Texas on her without any of the other States of the Union at all? Mexican statesmen have said they could whip the United States if we would keep Texas off her. If we should turn Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico, all three of them, at any time onto Mexico, we should never hear another word of the peons of Mexico.

Oh, my friend, the Senator from California, does not mean that sort of stuff; he really does not mean it. He thinks he means it now and then when he is talking freely, but he really does not mean that because the peon of Mexico despises the United States we should have an Army of 175,000 instead of an Army of 150,000 men; or because now and then a Negro in South Carolina despises a white man that the white man should go around all the time with a howitzer, a mountain pistol, and a rifle. He does not mean that. I have more respect for his intelligence than to think so.

Mr. President, I have been waiting all day to hear the testimony of Gen. Pershing. From the way Senators were talking about it I thought it must be awful, but when I came to hear it, it is this, as quoted by the Senator from California:

It seems to me we are getting on dangerous ground.

That is Pershing's utterance. Is not that an oracular sort of a thing? It sounds like the oracle of Delphi when the ambassadors from the Greek Republic came before it. Later on Gen. Pershing says:

It seems to me that at this moment no radical reduction should be made.

What that means I can not tell; what it means the Senator from California can not tell, or at least does not explain. I do not know what a "radical reduction" means; I do not know what "reduction" means. Reduction from what and to what and when? It means absolutely nothing. Of all the miraculous, oracular, indefinite, vague things I have ever heard, it is the most miraculous, oracular, indefinite, and vague. I do not think Gen. Pershing can have been accurately quoted. He must have said something more definite than that. Did Gen. Pershing tell us what he thinks the strength of the United States Army ought to be? I think the Senator from California said that Gen. Pershing said it ought to be 200,000 men. Is that correct?

Mr. PHELAN. Yes. The Senator from Mississippi has his testimony there. Gen. Pershing said the minimum number should be 200,000; the Secretary said 250,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, Mr. President, Gen. Pershing's testimony goes for naught, because Gen. Pershing stated that the strength of the United States Army, as the least possible skeleton around which to build flesh and muscle and blood, should be 200,000. Already the committee has reduced it by 25,000, and now all we wish to do is to reduce it by another 25,000.

Pershing is as badly off with the skeleton, even if he could keep all the bones, with a reduction of 25,000 men, as he would be with a reduction of 50,000. I believe the Senator from California is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PHELAN. No.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the Senator is defending the report of the committee; the committee has come in with a report pro-

posing to maim and cripple Pershing's estimate by 25,000 men; the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] comes in with a proposition to maim and cripple him by 25,000 more; and the Senator from California is supporting the 25,000 maim and cripple proposition, but is not supporting the other 25,000. What is the difference? If the skeleton will not fit by 25,000, it is not much worse off if it does not fit by 50,000.

Mr. PHELAN. It is a misfit.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; the Senator is supporting an absolute misfit of 25,000.

"A skeleton Army with power to expand." My God! expand to what? The funny thing about this debate is that nobody tells us to what this skeleton is going to expand; and yet they dwell with absolute literalness—and the Scripture says the letter kills while the spirit saves—on the skeleton as a prerequisite to the expansion, but never tell us what the expansion is. I defy the Senator from California right now to tell me in figures what the expansion is of men, officers, and various branches of artillery, infantry, and so forth.

Mr. PHELAN. That is to be determined by the necessity which may arise.

Mr. WILLIAMS. "Now, I have you on the hip," as Gratiano said to Shylock. "To be determined by necessity"—the skeleton to accord with the necessity, and the necessity to be determined by the necessity. Therefore there must be à la Pershing absolutely an Army of 200,000; à la the committee exactly 175,000; à la LENROOT exactly 150,000; à moi probably 100,000. The Senator tells me that the maximum up to which the skeleton is to be built is to be fixed by "necessity." Well, why not build the skeleton by necessity then, and why not consider the present moment as a part of the necessity?

Now, as a citizen of America, of whom are you afraid? Who is going to attack you in the immediate or in the remote future, so far as you know? Of whom are you scared? Why, Mr. President, the funniest thing about this is that this debate begins with a Yap and as far as the Senator from California is concerned it almost concludes in a yap, because he tells us that if we do not carry out this thing far enough we may probably lost Yap. Three-fourths of the Senate right now do not know where Yap is; nine-tenths of the Senate, including the Senator from California, and certainly including myself, never heard of Yap until the Versailles treaty was concluded, when we found out that Yap was an island somewhere in the Pacific. So we are going to yap for a big Army; we are going to yap against the Japanese; we are going to yap between a reduction of 25,000 and 50,000 in the Army, in order that we may have an opportunity to yap forever. I doubt if the Senator from California can tell me right now, by longitude and latitude, or even if the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], the best informed man in this body upon military affairs, can tell me by longitude and latitude where Yap is.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I presume my judgment of latitude and longitude is much like that of the Senator from Mississippi—somewhat mixed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the judgment of the Senator from Wyoming as to the latitude of Yap is like mine, it is the most vague and indefinite judgment that he could possibly describe. I positively do not know anything about Yap, and do not care anything about it, and I would not give a continental cent to-morrow for the difference between the United States having it and China having it and Japan having it and Great Britain having it and France having it and Germany having it, or even poor little Austria having it.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, the Senator asks me concerning the location of Yap. It is sufficient to know that it lies between our Philippine possessions and our possessions at Guam. But when the Senator says that two-thirds of the Senate have not heard about the Island of Yap, I desire to say that the Naval Affairs Committee was informed confidentially by the naval authorities that it was vital to our communications. That was stated in a document that was held confidential. It is not new. I knew it at that time. The Senator from Mississippi, not being a member of the committee, was not informed, and for that I am sorry. I recall a rhyme that—

The latitude is rather uncertain,  
And the longitude is equally vague,  
But that person I pity who knows not the city—  
The beautiful city of Prague.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I differ with the Senator from California about one thing. He rather regrets that I do not know, or did not know at some time, where Yap was. I am rather proud of the fact that I have not encumbered my intellect with any knowledge concerning Yap. A fellow has a good deal to learn in this world, and he ought to learn to conserve his intellect, and one of the best things that he can

do is to disregard Yap and all other nonessentials at the beginning; but there is some lesson in this.

This debate begins in favor of an Army of 175,000 against an Army of 150,000 in a yap, and concludes in a yap. That is about all there is to it.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, one word. I desire a vote as much as anyone, and I want to thank the Senator for having brought up the question of the protest of California, which I deny was a defiance.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I never said that it was a defiance.

Mr. PHELAN. The Senator said that the Southern States also made a protest, but finally had to resort to arms. Our very purpose in California is to make a protest at this time to prevent the Japanese becoming a race question, which may involve war, just as the importation of slaves in the early days of the Republic ultimately led to war. We are taking this precaution in time, and I am very glad that the Senator reminds me of that struggle.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the South also for 10 or 15 years prior to the Civil War again and again took State action of one sort or another and convention action of one sort or another, and always coupled it with the protestation, which was absolutely sincere, that its object was not to bring about a war, but to prevent war.

Mr. PHELAN. But you made no attempt to get rid of the Negroes. We want to eliminate the provocation in time and rid the State of the Japanese.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Ah! Mr. President, that reminds me of another thing that occurred on this floor some time ago. But, to go on with this thought, we also protested all the time that we were trying to preserve and not to destroy the Union, and we were trying to do it; but we finally got to a point which was a point of impasse, where we had to fight, and the other side had to fight, and then when that came we fought; and, by the way, we did not fight behind hedges. We did not fight hiddenly. We fought as brave men—not I; I mean my ancestors. I did not fight. I never fought anything much; but we did it.

"Ah," then the Senator says, "but you made no proposition to get rid of the Negroes."

I suppose he means to get rid of slavery—of course, we could not get rid of the Negroes without killing them. That reminds me that in a previous debate upon this floor the Senator said something which I did not at that time hear. I have much wherewith to charge my deaf ears. I wish that I had heard it. It was when he exclaimed, in highly dramatic tones, "Ireland fights for liberty and the South fought for slavery!"

Mr. President, if the Senator from California were right about that, then the greatest man upon the northern side, Abraham Lincoln, and the greatest man upon the southern side, Robert E. Lee, were liars, and the Senator from California is the only man who knows what the sections fought about. Abraham Lincoln, in his first inaugural, just before the war broke out, professed upon the east portico of this Capitol, right out here, in substance: "I do not pretend that we have the constitutional right or the power to interfere with slavery wherever it exists, nor are we fighting for that." I am not quoting him accurately. The Senator ought to remember what he said, in spirit. And Robert E. Lee, later on, said: "I would set every Negro that I have free to-morrow rather than have this trouble." But after Abraham Lincoln said that we were not fighting about slavery, but were fighting, from his standpoint, to maintain the Union, and after Robert E. Lee—noble descendant of thousands of English ancestry, all noble in their way—said that he was not fighting to maintain slavery, but was fighting for the right of self-determination, the right of a community to adopt and maintain its own government, which seems to be a right sacred right now in Ireland across the ocean; then steps into the arena the great Senator from California, and pronounces Abraham Lincoln and Robert E. Lee both liars, while he himself becomes the infallible pope of the history of the war between the States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is clearly out of order if the rules of the Senate are to be obeyed.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Question!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Would it be possible to decide upon concurrence in these amendments en bloc, or should it be done one by one?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There was no reservation in Committee of the Whole for a separate vote in the Senate. There is just one of two things that can be done. One is not to concur in these amendments, and then submit other amendments to the Senate; or the action can be taken back, the vote whereby

the joint resolution passed to the Senate can be reconsidered, and the bill can go back to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think, if it is agreeable to the Senate, it would be quicker to take a vote on concurrence in all the amendments at once. If that motion to concur, which is the pending motion, fails, then the bill is open to amendment, still being in the Senate; and in that event I should offer an amendment correcting the bill so that 62½ per cent of the various branches may be substituted for 53½ per cent, and the amendments reported from the committee to which there was no objection might also be included.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire a separate vote on the question of the size of the Army, because I have no objection to the other amendments, and I would not care to vote against them. In fact, I think they ought to go in; but I want a separate vote upon the number, because we can not vote intelligently in any other way.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But the Vice President has informed me that a separate vote was not reserved for any of the amendments in the Senate.

Mr. SWANSON. It is not necessary to reserve it. It comes up as a new proposition in the Senate. When there is a close yea-and-nay vote, as in Committee of the Whole, it is customary to reserve a question so that there is an excuse for not taking the vote on concurrence en bloc. This is a reconsideration of the vote concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BORAH. I should assume that the question would be as to whether or not we would concur in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; and the Chair is ruling that as the record now stands there can be but one vote upon that question, there having been no reservation of a separate vote upon any particular amendment in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It really makes no difference so far as the result is concerned, I will say to the Senator from Idaho. Those who desire an Army of 175,000 will vote against concurring in all the amendments. Those who want an Army of 150,000 will vote to concur in the amendments. If those favoring an Army of 175,000 prevail, then all the amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole will be stricken from the bill, whereupon I shall endeavor to secure the floor and offer amendments to perfect the bill as it came from the committee on the basis of 175,000.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, as I understand, this amendment came from Committee of the Whole fixing the number at 150,000, did it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There are other amendments besides that.

Mr. SWANSON. There are other amendments, but I say the amendment came from the Committee of the Whole fixing the number at 150,000, not 175,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Exactly.

Mr. SWANSON. Then, what is the pending question—that all these amendments, including the number of 150,000, be voted upon?

The VICE PRESIDENT. To be sure.

Mr. SWANSON. There is no amendment pending for 175,000 at all, then, is there?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Of course not. If they are concurred in, the status is fixed at 150,000. If they are not concurred in, the body of the act remains at 175,000.

Mr. SWANSON. As I understand, there is a general rule to the effect that where a proposition contains different propositions a separate vote can be asked for; but I have never seen anything in the rules or in the precedents saying that it must be reserved. It is generally reserved as a matter of precaution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is going to stick to his ruling, however, until the Senate overrules him.

Mr. SWANSON. The Chair usually does when he makes one.

Mr. BORAH. Especially if he is right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is right in that, too.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, as I understand, those who should vote "yea" on the question as to concurring in the amendments would be voting for 150,000?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Exactly.

Mr. BORAH. And those who should vote "nay" would vote so that they could afterwards have an opportunity to vote for 175,000.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, it seems to me, if the Senator will permit me, that if this joint resolution should go into the Committee of the Whole, then the motion to go into the Senate could be preceded by a request to reserve these two amendments for a separate vote. If that is done, we will get a direct vote on those two amendments, because everybody, as I



understand, concurs in the general amendments to the bill except this one fixing the number at 175,000 and the one in regard to the 62½ per cent, which must be changed if we change the number of men.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Question!

Mr. DIAL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I hope the Senator will withdraw that suggestion. I think there is a quorum present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. We had one just a moment ago.

Mr. BORAH. They are not here now.

Mr. DIAL. I withdraw the suggestion, Mr. President.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The yeas and nays will determine it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks nothing has been done since the last quorum call.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No business has transpired.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, then, will not entertain the motion.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, would it not be possible, by unanimous consent, to vote separately on the question mentioned by the Senator from Idaho?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senate so desires, there is no reason in the world why it should not, by unanimous consent, send the joint resolution back to the Committee of the Whole and vote on each of these amendments. The Senate can send the joint resolution back to the Committee of the Whole, set aside all the votes on all the amendments, and then proceed to vote on the amendments.

There is no reason why it can not be done. Is there any objection?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I do not want to object, but it seems to me that the thing we should do is to vote in the regular way on whether or not the amendments of the Committee of the Whole shall be approved. If it should develop that they are approved, that would approve the 150,000 amendment and also all the others. It would end it. If it should develop that the motion is defeated, then, all the committee amendments are defeated, and the joint resolution is subject to amendment in the Senate; and there would not be any objection—I suppose it could be done by unanimous consent—to having the Senator immediately offer his amendment and that would end it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is the plan I proposed.

Mr. NORRIS. As I understand, then, the vote now is on this question: Shall the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole be concurred in by the Senate?

If the Senator from Michigan will give us his attention for just a moment, suppose, as he says, that that question is decided in the negative; then the bill is still in the Senate and open to amendment, and the Senator from New York can offer his amendment, and it will go through, as a matter of course.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Under those circumstances, would a committee amendment, after having been defeated in the Senate, be subject to be offered again in the Senate?

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to say to the Senator that it has not been defeated separately. If the motion is decided in the negative, the amendments are all defeated, en bloc.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Can any one of them be offered again in the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has not any doubt about that. Of course, they can be offered in the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask for the yeas and nays on concurring in the amendments.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is going to state the question as the record stands now. The question is, Will the Senate concur in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL]. He is absent, but I understand he would vote as I shall, and, being at liberty to vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. HENDERSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK]. In his absence I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] and vote "nay."

Mr. KNOX (when his name was called). I am informed that my pair, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], would vote as I propose to vote, in the negative. Therefore I am at liberty to vote, and vote "nay."

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]. I do not know how he would vote upon this subject. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when the name of Mr. SMITH of South Carolina was called). The senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] asked me to announce that he is compelled to be absent on account of important business, and that he is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. STERLING]. I ask that the announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. NEW (when Mr. WATSON's name was called). I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. WATSON] on account of illness. He is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT]. If here and permitted to vote, my colleague would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. FALL. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SHERMAN (after having voted in the negative). I understand the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] has not voted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have with him a general pair. I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. OWEN. I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. McCUMBER. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]. Not knowing what his vote would be upon this question, I withhold my vote.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS];

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT]; and

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. STERLING] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] on account of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 41, as follows:

#### YEAS—33.

Borah	Jones, N. Mex.	Owen	Swanson
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Pittman	Trammell
Dial	Kenyon	Reed	Underwood
Gerry	King	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
Gore	La Follette	Simmons	Walsh, Mont.
Gronna	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Harrison	McNary	Smith, Md.	
Heflin	Norris	Smoot	
Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Stanley	

#### NAYS—41.

Ashurst	Gay	McLean	Sherman
Beckham	Gooding	Moses	Smith, Ga.
Brandegge	Hale	Myers	Spencer
Calder	Harris	Nelson	Sutherland
Colt	Henderson	New	Townsend
Curtis	Hitchcock	Penrose	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Johnson, Calif.	Phelan	Warren
Fall	Kellogg	Phipps	Willis
Fernald	Keyes	Poindexter	
Fletcher	Kirby	Ransdell	
Frelinghuysen	Knox	Robinson	

#### NOT VOTING—22.

Ball	France	McCumber	Sterling
Chamberlain	Glass	Newberry	Thomas
Culbertson	Kendrick	Page	Watson
Cummins	Lenroot	Pomerene	Wolcott
Edge	Lodge	Shields	
Elkins	McCormick	Smith, S. C.	

So the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole were nonconcurrent in.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I offer a number of amendments, indicated upon the copy of the joint resolution, which I send to the desk and I ask that they may be acted upon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendments in their order.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. Offered on behalf of the Committee on Military Affairs:

On page 2, line 4, strike out the words "and instructed"; at the end of line 4, after the words "Regular Army," insert "except reenlistments of men who at the time of the passage of this act have served more than one year in the Regular Army or the Army of the United States during the recent emergency," and a comma; on line 10, after the words "pay of," insert the words "more than 175,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. After the word "Congress" and the period at the end of line 11, insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, however, That during the period in which the Army is being reduced to such enlisted strength sufficient enlistments may be made in any branch of the Army to bring such branch to not more

than 62½ per cent of the number prescribed therefor in the act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes,' approved June 3, 1916, and to establish military justice," approved June 4, 1920.

The amendment was agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. Insert a new section in the joint resolution, as follows:

SEC. 2. That until the enlisted strength of the Army is reduced to 175,000 men the Secretary of War is authorized in his discretion to grant applications for discharge of enlisted men who have served one year or more with records satisfactory to their commanding officers without regard to the provisions of existing law respecting discharges.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senate reconsiders the vote whereby it amended the preamble and the title of the bill, and the preamble and title will stand as reported from the committee.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15130) making appropriations for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 18, 1921, at 12 o'clock meridian.

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, January 17, 1921.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Rev. John H. Jeffries, D. D., of the Ryland Methodist Episcopal Church, of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Let the words of our mouth and the meditations of our heart be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our redeemer. Command Thy blessing to rest upon Thy servants here to conserve the best interests of the Nation. May they walk in the consciousness of divine direction. May the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, rest upon us this morning and upon this Nation, and may all that shall be said and done be to the honor and glory of God. We ask it in the name of our common Lord and Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 15, 1921, was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message in writing from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had, on January 13, 1921, approved and signed the bill of the following title:

H. R. 12337. An act to provide for the relief of Anthony Sulik, former sergeant, United States Marine Corps.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT CALENDAR.

The SPEAKER. This is suspension day, and the Clerk will call the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

#### COURTHOUSE AND JAIL AT CORDOVA, ALASKA.

The first business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 12437) to authorize the expenditure of the sum of \$100,000 heretofore appropriated for the erection of a United States post office, courthouse, and jail at Cordova, Alaska, by the act approved March 4, 1913, for the erection of a United States courthouse and jail at Cordova, Alaska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the bill is one which I have no doubt is peculiarly within the information of the Delegate from Alaska, and I have reserved the right to object in order that he may explain the circumstances and the necessity for the appropriation.

Mr. LANGLEY. I suggest that the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. GRIGSBY] explain the bill.

Mr. GRIGSBY. Mr. Speaker, the bill is one to make available for the construction of a courthouse and jail, the sum of \$100,000, which was appropriated in 1913 to construct a courthouse and jail and post office. The sum was found to be insufficient for that kind of a building. The Supervising Architect, however, reported that he could construct the courthouse and

jail with that amount. This bill makes available that sum for that purpose. There is no additional appropriation. It is simply making available an original appropriation.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GRIGSBY. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. I did not understand. What was the original appropriation?

Mr. GRIGSBY. One hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. SNELL. And is this for an additional appropriation?

Mr. GRIGSBY. No; it is not. It is to make available the same amount of money for a building which can be constructed.

Mr. SNELL. They are going to erect a new type of building that can be constructed for the \$100,000?

Mr. GRIGSBY. For the same money, and dispense with the post-office part of the building.

Mr. SNELL. What will be the proposition in future years for a post office? Will they have to have another building for that later on?

Mr. GRIGSBY. The Government has not appropriated any money for post offices in Alaska up to date. They rent post-office buildings all over the Territory, and probably will continue to do so.

Mr. LANGLEY. The committee reported this bill because it asked for no additional appropriation, but merely a modification of the original plans to come within the limits of the appropriation already made.

Mr. SNELL. The thought I had in mind was, if they would come back for an additional appropriation for a post office.

Mr. LANGLEY. It does not look now as if anybody will have a chance to "come back" on that score at an early date.

Mr. SNELL. I think it is a proper thing to know whether, as soon as that is done, there will be a request for an additional sum for a post office.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman from Alaska [Mr. GRIGSBY] can answer that question. The committee does not know what the purpose is in that regard, but will, of course, consider any proposition presented at the proper time, just as they will any other proposition.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman from Alaska yield?

Mr. GRIGSBY. I will.

Mr. MONDELL. There are a great many cases in which the appropriations for public buildings are inadequate for the construction of the buildings as planned at this time. There are, as I recollect it, upward of 100, perhaps 150, such cases in the country.

Mr. LANGLEY. One hundred and sixteen, I think, that are classed as "emergency cases" by the department, although there are many more than that that are really emergent.

Mr. MONDELL. One hundred and sixteen, the gentleman says. We are making no provision for the 116, although some of the buildings are badly needed. I take it for granted that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, when it reported this bill, reported it because of some extraordinary emergency existing in Cordova. Is that true? If there is no extraordinary condition existing at Cordova over and above and beyond the conditions existing elsewhere throughout the country, then there is no justification for a bill of this kind, and it seems to me the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY], the chairman of the committee, ought to be able to inform the House whether or not there is some extraordinary condition of urgency at Cordova over and above and beyond that existing elsewhere which justified the reporting of a bill for Cordova which accomplishes, by the elimination of one use, the erection of a building which could not otherwise be erected without an increase of the limit of cost.

Mr. LANGLEY. I will state to the gentleman that the distinction between this and the other class of cases is that this does not involve an additional appropriation, while the other propositions would involve it, and I will say further that I did not happen to be in the city when the hearing was had and the report prepared, and am not, therefore, as familiar with the facts as I would otherwise be.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. It does involve an additional appropriation.

Mr. SNELL. Because we are doing only a part of the work.

Mr. MONDELL (continuing). Because you are eliminating one of the purposes for which the building is to be used, evidently with the idea of providing for a post office later. So that this bill does in effect involve an increase just as much as though it had increased the limit of cost in the bill.

Mr. LANGLEY. Now, the gentleman from Alaska can perhaps explain what the purpose is in that regard, and I suggest that he enlighten the gentleman and the House.